

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VIII

FEBRUARY, 1908

NO. 8

Woman and the Socialist Movement.

I.

AMONG recent political and social movements the revival, internationally, of the agitation for political equality among women is one of the most significant. There are two features of this movement which impress the student: In the first place, the women are no longer content with the methods of pink-tea-party propaganda; nice little lady-like salon meetings and scented notes to legislators begging their votes. Instead of these methods there is an aggressive, well-planned campaign with not a little of the revolutionary spirit in it.

The English "Suffragettes" seem to have set the fires of revolt ablaze. The nickname was hurled at them in a spirit of mingled scorn and ridicule, but they have accepted it and are at present doing their best to make it glorious as so many of the sneering nicknames of history have become. Storming the old soporific House of Commons, and the platforms of their opponents at public meetings; holding meetings in Hyde Park and Trafalgar Square; parading along the Thames Embankment with defiant banners floating in the breeze, or curling limply in the London fog; cheerfully going to prison and doing other "unwomanly" things, they act in the spirit of revolutionaries and adopt the same methods as the Chartists, the unemployed armies and the Socialists in their historic fights for free speech. Obviously, there must be good revolutionary material in these armies of women demanding their rights of citizenship. In New York this winter, when the weather was far too cold for Socialist agitation, women,

moved by the same spirit as the English sisters, have been holding open-air meetings. Fanatical? Well, perhaps so. It is hardly the most rational thing in the world to hold street meetings in zero weather: any doctor will tell you that. But, then, all revolutionary movements are fanatical; the "fanatics" are the men and women who keep the altar fires burning. Every one of the great revolutionaries of history was a fanatic, so that these women are in good revolutionary company.

In the second place, the women who are demanding their political enfranchisement are no longer confined to the few intellectuals and the elite. The working women are interested, hence the revolutionary spirit. The proletarian women, wage-earners in factories, workshops, stores, offices, and other people's kitchens are awakening. And those other proletarians who are not wage-earners but something worse, the wives of the workers, are also stirring and demanding rights. They are the "proletarians of the home," in Clara Zetkin's phrase: they are the slaves of slaves.

Socialists who have iterated and reiterated the shibboleth that "They who would be free must themselves strike the blow to break the chains which bind them," ought not to be surprised that our sisters have come to regard that as one of the great lessons of history. They have waited upon the "goodness" and "justice" of men for a long time now, with just as little result as the workers have realized from waiting upon similar virtues in their masters. Even within the ranks of the Socialists our few women comrades have learned that they must not depend upon the men; that there is a sex prejudice, however repressed and concealed, as surely as there is a class struggle. There has been a good deal of unreality and pretense about the equality of the sexes in the Socialist movement about which we have boasted.

II.

Of course, I know that in all our Socialist programmes we have given a foremost position to the demand for the political and economic equality of the sexes. This we have done upon principle, in the days when even the women themselves were not at all interested and when it was distinctly unpopular. We can therefore very rightly claim that the Socialist movement has always been on the side of women's freedom and that its interest in the matter has not been inspired by a desire for political gain.

It is true, also, that women have always been admitted to the Socialist parties of the world—when they came and asked for admission. We inherited our attitude toward women from the Utopian Socialists, along with a good many other traditions. And it was not very much of a sacrifice, after all, to assume the unpopularity of declaring for the abolition of

sex distinctions in citizenship. It couldn't increase our unpopularity very much when we had already declared for the abolition of so many other things.

Historically and theoretically, then, the Socialist movement stands for the emancipation of woman no less than for that of man. As an abstract principle, a pious expression of opinion, I have no doubt that one could get a unanimous vote in every Socialist local in the land in favor of the principle of equal suffrage. I have attended a great many Socialist conventions and congresses at which resolutions in support of the principle have been voted, and I do not at this time recall one of them at which there was a single vote against it.

But, while we have voted for the principle, and given it a place in our programmes, I think most candid Socialists will agree with me that we have not regarded it very seriously. At any rate, we have not made it very conspicuous in our agitation. True, when there has been an agitation among women for the suffrage we have always said to them: "You ought to join our party, for we are pledged to the principle you are advocating," but we have never gone very much further. How often do we hear the subject mentioned at public meetings of the party, for example? Is it not a fact that most of our speeches and by far the greatest part of our propaganda literature have been addressed to men, as though it was not worth while to consider the women? If a personal word may be pardoned, I know that I have been regarded as a "crank" on the subject, simply because I have made it a practice during many years to express my pleasure at seeing women at the meetings I have addressed, and my belief that their stake in the social problem is at least as great as that of their brothers.

Harsh as it may sound, I say that we have consistently and deliberately ignored the woman's side of our programme. There are many reasons for this into which I shall not at this time enter—racial and religious traditions among the most important of them. Relics of the ancient contempt for woman's intelligence and the ancient religious subjection of the sex to its overlords have remained latent in the most earnest of our comrades, blinding them very often to the fact that "Workers of the world unite!" means the woman in the factory as well as the man who works by her side; the woman toiling at home with the babies as well as her husband in the workshop or the mine.

Generally speaking we have tolerated our women comrades instead of welcoming them with enthusiasm and treating them with comradeship and equality. I know of one case in which a number of women members of the party—among

them a lady whose Socialism dated back twenty years or more, who was an intimate friend of Ruskin and Morris—were frankly and bluntly told that they “could belong to the party and pay dues, if they liked, but the comrades would rather not have them at the meetings”! That was, of course quite an exceptional case, but I have often felt that if other comrades were less disingenuous and more candid they would confess to a very similar feeling toward the women comrades. Often our meetings are held in saloons where women will not come. When we have tolerated them in our locals we have not seriously regarded our sisters as our equals, but have regarded them as useful only to make cakes for tea-parties or “fancy things” to sell at fairs for raising funds. There have been exceptions, of course, but that has been the attitude in a majority of cases, so far as my observation has gone, and the women comrades have patiently and silently accepted their lot. True, wherever possible, we have used them as propagandists; when a woman has shown herself able and willing to make speeches, we have gladly used her, but here again, we have used her mainly as an “attraction,” because the novelty of a woman speaker at a political meeting attracts the crowd! We have expected her, moreover, to make her appeal to men and begrudged every word she had to say by way of a special message to her own sex.

Now, at last, the women have awakened and taken matters into their own hands. When the movement for a separate organization of Socialist women began to assert itself a few years ago, I was one of those who, while believing heartily that our sister comrades were justified, urged them to remain in the party and to make their fight for recognition from the inside. I still adhere to that view of the situation. There can be no question, however, that the women are right in choosing their own methods and it remains only for the men to support them and co-operate with them. It is high time that the Socialist Party paid more serious attention to woman's share in the social misery of today, her vital stake in the movement for the liberation of mankind and her enormous influence either for progress or reaction. We need a much more extensive propaganda among the mothers, wives, sisters and daughters of America.

Personally, I should like to see established in connection with the party a National Committee of Women, to be charged with this special work. It might be necessary to “ear-mark,” as they say in the British parliament, for their special work the dues of all women comrades in the party, or some other method of raising funds for that purpose could be devised. In any case, the administrative difficulties are not

insuperable. Propagandists, especially women, equipped to present the claims of Socialism to women, could be engaged and steps taken to obtain suitable propaganda literature for circulation among women employed as wage-earners and other women who are doing the drudgery of household management and family life.

It is, I think, a most significant fact that we have practically no such literature at the present time. There are, it is true, a few scientific — and a few more pseudo-scientific — treatises dealing with the position of women in society in its historical aspects, with some speculations upon matters biological and physiological. For the rest our literature for women has been almost wholly of the Utopian variety, pictures of co-operative housekeeping, communal laundries and the like.

Most unsatisfactory of all has been the treatment of the subject of woman's place in society. Most of our literature on this point has been based upon the assumption that any other employment for women than household and maternal duties must be considered abnormal and wrong. Who is there in our movement that is not familiar with the promise that Socialism will do away with "unnatural labor" for women and enable them to stay at home; said unnatural labor being anything and everything except house-wifery and maternity; the endless chain of sweeping, washing, mending, scrubbing, cooking, child-bearing and nursing which gives truth to the ancient proverb that

"Man's work is from sun to sun,
But woman's work is never done."

Upon the whole, it seems not too much to say that anything less likely to attract an intelligent woman, or more likely to repel her, than the average Socialist pamphlet written for women it would be difficult to conceive.

III.

Those who have seen or read Ibsen's play, "The Master Builder," will remember that one of the most impressive moments is when Halvard Solness, the master builder, tells that elfin-like creature, Hilda Wangel, the story of the tragedy of his wife's life; of the sorrow which made her the poor, pathetic wraith of a woman she is. He speaks of her as having "lost her vocation as a builder" — for she, too, was a builder. With terrible earnestness, he explains that it is a woman's vocation to be "the builder of the souls of little children."

I suppose that for most women this is true. It is woman's function to be the bearer and nourisher of the race. Socialism will not affect that great law of life. It will, however, insure women the right to follow their vocation. In any sane society it will be recognized that motherhood is a service to the State as important as any other, and far more important than making base commodities for profit. The supreme crime of capitalism, taking the mother away from her baby and sending her to a factory to become part of a machine, or even sending her away from her own baby to nurse some other woman's, will be remembered as a monstrous thing when the race has developed a sane and wholesome view of life. Childhood will not be robbed of maternal care in order that sweat-ears may thrive and bequeath a gilded parasitism to their children.

Socialism comes to unbind womanhood, to liberate the Great Nourisher of the race. Those who are familiar with the work of Stephan Sinding, the great Scandinavian sculptor, will remember his wonderful protest in marble, "The Captive Mother." A nude woman, with hands tightly bound with cords behind her back, kneels on the ground and bends painfully forward to suckle her little infant at her copious breasts. I do not know whether Sinding meant to carve into the marble all that I read out of it, but I never see that painful figure without regarding it as a symbol of woman's bondage. Bound by ignorance, by man's lordship, by ties of economic dependence, by false conventions and moral codes, by all the numberless limitations imposed upon her by the age-long despotism which is so slowly — but surely! — breaking up: Socialism must come to woman as the Dawn of Freedom, or it can have no meaning for her.

If the maternal vocation does not appeal to some women in the days to be; if they desire to pursue other vocations, whether in the fields with the plough or in the workshops with ringing tools, they must be free to live their lives in their own way. It is not for man to set metes and bounds to woman's freedom, for it is not true that, as Tennyson says,
 "Woman is the lesser man."

The soul of Socialism is as much a living protest against social distinctions based upon sex as against such distinctions based upon property.

The goal of freedom can never be attained by a master sex dragging a subject sex behind it any more than it can be won by a master class dragging a subject class behind it. If our movement is to prevail we must have all proletarians, regardless of sex, with us. From this point of view, which I can give to be the only one compatible with Socialist prin-

ciples, it is essential that our stand for sex equality be made something more than a pious opinion: a real, vital and earnest part of our faith and our struggle. I do not urge that we should drop other things to concentrate our energies upon the task of securing political enfranchisement for women, but that the subject receive its just share of attention in our propaganda.

And, above all, I ask that some steps be taken to develop our propaganda among women — to carry to all women who toil, whether in factories or kitchens, the message of Socialism and Hope.

JOHN SPARGO.

Methods of Propaganda.

"My strength is as the strength of ten,
Because my heart is pure." TENNYSON in **Sir Galahad**.

"And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love." I. Corinthians, XIII, 13.

So many other comrades have so much wider experience than have I in the actual work of propaganda that I feel I must preface this article by an apology for my presumption in writing on this topic. I have no disposition to speak as one having authority, but merely want to talk to my comrades as one who like all the others is interested in finding out the most effective ways of doing the work we all have at heart. The ideas that have grown up in my mind as a result of a little experience and much reflection I shall give you. Where I fall into error, wiser comrades will correct me in future numbers of the Review. In this way the experience of each can be put at the service of all. And that after all is the function of this Review — to serve as a clearing-house for the exchange of ideas between comrades.

The chief essential for effective propaganda is the right sort of propagandist. The qualities that form a good Socialist propagandist are — whether my materialist comrades shy at the term or not — spiritual qualities; and they are the same that went to make a man a good Christian in the days of the early church, and a good knight errant in the days of Chivalry. The earnest Socialist may well take as his mottoes the words of Tennyson and Paul quoted at the head of this article. Galahad's strength was as the strength of ten because his heart was pure. The effectiveness of the Socialist agitator to-day is in direct ratio with the purity of his heart. If his words are to influence others, he must be single-hearted in his devotion to the Cause, ever ready for the day which William Morris tells us.

"..... is drawing nigh,
When the Cause shall call upon us, some to live, and some to die!"

His absorption in the cause of the World's Workers must be so complete that he will, not sacrifice his petty personal interests, but simply lose sight of them. The successful Socialist agitator to-day must be a modern Knight of Arthur's Table Round. Such a one like Galahad will have the strength of ten. Only the pure in heart can repeat without mental reservations Morris' noble lines,

"Life or death then, who shall heed it, what we gain or what we lose?
Fair flies life amid the struggle, and the Cause for each shall choose."

And only the Comrade who thus finds himself by losing himself can be a valiant and effective warrior in the Army for Human Emancipation.

To the fully armed and equipped for the fray the Champions of the Proletariat must have Faith, Hope and Love; but the greatest of these is love. No Socialist agitator can reach a high level of efficiency unless he has real faith in the Working Class. A mere utopian longing for the Co-operative Commonwealth, with a vague hope that misery may drive the workers into working for it, will not do. The working class will not believe in the man or woman who does not believe in them. The modern Socialist Knight who lacks faith in the Proletariat will never draw the sword "Excalibur" from the rock. He is marching into battle unarmed. Faith in the working-class depends upon knowledge of the working-class, though, like theological faith, it will be none-the-less effective if it transcends knowledge. It is possible to have faith in the qualities, the capacities and potentialities of the working-class without in the least idealizing it, or blinding oneself to its many defects. No writer of the present day has drawn so relentless a picture of the unlovely aspects of proletarian life as Maxim Gorky; but no writer of the present day has so nobly shown such high faith in and such pure love for the Proletariat. The first great speaker and agitator of the modern Socialist Movement was Ferdinand Lassalle. No one has yet surpassed him in power and effectiveness. What was the secret of this extraordinary power? Read his "**Workingman's Programme**," and see. It was his tremendous, prophetic, undoubting faith in the Working Class as the Rulers of To-morrow. He always seems to me to be standing with head bared before the Princes of the Future. I think it was due to no accident or conventionality that in his speeches he so frequently repeated the formal "Herren," Gentlemen. He looked forward with magnificent faith to a world in which all men would be *gentlemen* in the best sense of that much abused word, and he recognized in the workers before him more of the essential qualities of the ideal gentleman than were to be found in the Upper Classes and Court Circles of the day.

"For the Colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady are sisters under their skins." We Socialists do not credit the Proletariat with any miraculous virtues. We know that they are made of the same common clay as Kings, Professors and Millionaires. Like all other classes they are the product of their

environment. But they are the only class in which Civilization has not blunted, stifled or extinguished the sense of human solidarity. In no other class to-day is there any attempt made to put the ethics of Jesus into practice. The ambitious Socialist speaker or writer who shows contempt for his untaught comrades, is not injuring them, but paralyzing himself. But the man who has struggled with the actualities of life, has earned his bread and butter by selling his manual labor on the labor-market, has gone into the shop and worked side by side with fellow-workers — even though they never heard of Socialism — can never again lose faith in the Working-Class, the Lords of the Days to Be.

Besides Faith the effective Socialist agitator must be armed with Hope Invincible. He must be a Herald of the World's Hope. It is his function and privilege to proclaim glad tidings of great joy which shall be to all people. He must believe in this joy and in its coming. Every Socialist speech should begin with a paraphrase of Morris' spirited lines,

"Come hither lads, and hearken, for a tale there is to tell,
Of the wonderful days a-coming, when all shall be better than well."

This hope should be more than hope; it should be an assured conviction of the certainty of Victory. When we speak of the "wonderful days a-coming" we should use, not the language of dreamers, but the language of KNOWERS. The most effective Socialist speaker it has been my privilege to know is our Comrade Fred Long of Philadelphia. What an inspiration it is to hear his "I KNOW" ring out! Fred Long, workingman, type-setter, has made more Socialists by his magnificently triumphant manner of pronouncing those two words than have most of our college-bred comrades by hours of rounded periods and finished elocution. He is the one man I know who, it seems to me, could bring out the full force of William Morris'

"Come, join in the only battle wherein no man can fail,
Where whoso fadeth and dieth, yet his deed shall still prevail."

The early preachers of Christianity, who turned a despised sect into a World-Religion, not only believed in the Second coming of the Son of Man to establish the reign of Justice on Earth, but they believed in his **speedy** coming — that some of their own hearers would witness it. Every Socialist speaker who has made Socialists has had an equally strong belief in the speedy coming of the Social Revolution. Gaylord Wilshire has preached the Inevitability of Socialism in season and out of season, and **Wilshire's Magazine** has 300,000 readers to-day. The **Appeal to Reason** has never faltered

in proclaiming the message of hope and deliverance, and its circulation grows so fast we grow dizzy in trying to keep track of it. In our hours of quiet study let us fortify our hope with the scientific arguments of Marx and Engels and Veblen; but in our propaganda work let us stick to Fred Long's assured "I KNOW!" In a time of suffering and unemployment like the present, what a privilege to be the heralds of Hope! To sing the words of Morris:—

"And hope is marching on.

"On we march then, we the workers, and the rumor that ye hear

"Is the blended sound of battle and deliverance drawing near;

"For the hope of every creature is the banner that we bear."

"But the greatest of these is love." The one absolutely essential qualification for a good propagandist is LOVE. Socialism that is founded on sentiment alone is without foundation and will topple over at the first shock of conflict; but Socialism without Love is futile, barren and impotent. The idea that all sentiment and emotion is unscientific is a blighting and paralyzing curse, which has long been a serious handicap to the Socialist Movement. Love for the Proletariat should be a blazing passion in the breast of every true Socialist. It was the motive force in the life of Marx as it was in that of Jesus — if the word proletariat may for the nonce be applied to the poor of Jesus' day. I think we shall be all the better Socialists if we reach the plane where we even love our enemies — but love them with a clear understanding of the Class Struggle, realizing that the best way to show our love is to fight them with every weapon within our reach.

Those who wish to proscribe sentiment and emotion in the Socialist Movement are fond of quoting Liebknecht: "Pity for poverty, enthusiasm for equality and freedom, recognition of social injustice and a desire to remove it is not Socialism." Those words are quite true, but if they would turn over a few pages they would find these words charged with deep emotion: "All who are weary and heavy laden; all who suffer under injustice; all who suffer from the outrages of the existing bourgeois society; all who have in them the feeling of the worth of humanity, look to us, turn hopefully to us, as the only party that can bring rescue and deliverance." And Liebknecht's whole life, his unwearying labor for the Cause, his cheerful demeanor in prison, was one long demonstration of love for the Proletariat. Our much vaunted and too-little-practiced comradeship is nothing if it is not that Love of which Paul wrote that it "suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up. Doth not behave itself unseemly, **seeketh not her own**, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but re-

joiceth in the truth; Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."

That is a picture of the kind of Comradeship I want to see in the Socialist Party right here in America. When we have it, you won't have to climb a very high Pisgah peak to look over into the promised land of the Co-operative Commonwealth. But such Comradeship as we now have is the nearest approach to the realization of Paul's description of Love that has yet been made on Earth. How precious it is, those who do not share it cannot realize. But here we are very far from our ideal. Our comrades are too often easily provoked at one another. Far from bearing all things, enduring all things, very slight differences on economics or tactics are too often enough to disrupt the ties of comradeship, and divert for years to internecine conflict talents and energies that should be used against Capitalism. If our Love for each other as comrades, and our love for the working-class were stronger, these petty squabbles between comrades which not only disgrace but cripple the Socialist Movement would be impossible. "Brethren, these things ought not so to be." I have been an egregious sinner along this line myself, but I am going to swear off. The great need of the American Movement to-day is more emotion, more sentiment (not sickly sentimentality), more LOVE. A Socialist speaker may know all three volumes of Marx's **CAPITAL** by heart, but if his heart is not filled with love for the Proletariat he will never make a single Socialist. Such a one may truly apply to himself Paul's words: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing."

Another essential attribute of the good propagandist is Energy. There is a story told of the boy who when asked if his father was a Christian, replied: "Yes, but he does not istis but don't work much at it. In Socialism as in every thing work much at it." There are too many of us who are Social-else Robert Browning's principle is a good one:

"Stake your counter as boldly every whit,
 "Venture as warily, use the same skill,
 "Do your best, whether winning or losing it.
 "If you choose to play! is my principle.
 "Let a man contend to the uttermost
 "For his life's set prize, be it what it will!"

Because as revolutionists we reject much of the master-taught morality of the current codes, it does not follow that

we are to lead lives of license. On the contrary, as heralds of a higher, nobler and purer society it is incumbent upon us to show forth the superiority of our ideals by the beauty of our daily lives. This aspect of Socialism has been too much neglected in most of our Socialist literature. But it has found noble expression in Lassalle's "**Workingman's Programme**"—one of the very best pamphlets the Socialist Movement has ever had. A class called upon to be the rulers of the Future should lead lives worthy of their high calling. Such a life is the very best kind of Socialist propaganda. Much credit is due the Christian Socialists for keeping to the front high and worthy ethical ideals. But when they object to our publishing and distributing literature showing the earthly and materialistic origin of those ideals, we cannot yield to them in spite of our love for them as comrades and our recognition of how much the Socialist cause owes to them. For if it were not for our knowledge that a revolution in the materialistic and economic base of life must bring in its wake a revolution in our intellectual life and in our spiritual ideals, our philosophy would be a hog's philosophy of the trough and the belly. All of the lofty idealism of Socialism is rooted in Materialism. Were this not true there would not be a Christian Socialist on earth to-day. So to our Christian Socialist comrades we say: Let us each continue to do our work, and in spite of our differences let us cleave to that comradeship which "is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; Beareth all things, endureth all things."

If we had fifty thousand such Socialist propagandists as I have tried to describe, we would not have to worry much about methods of propaganda. But even then methods of propaganda would have their importance. To-day their importance is very great for the harvest is white and the laborers are few, so that it is of the utmost importance to economize our energies by using the most effective methods possible. To change the metaphor we are sowers of seed rather than reapers, and those of us who recall Christ's parable of the sower know that in sowing seed the great thing is not to waste the seed by the wayside or upon stony places or among thorns, but to sow just as much of it as is possible upon good ground. Now, the only good ground for Socialist seed is to be found in the heads of men who have been prepared by the very conditions of their lives to receive the seed and germinate it. We find more of such men among the industrial, urban proletariat than in any other class or section of the community, so that is where our energies should be concentrated. Of course this does not mean that other sections or portions of the community are to be neglected or repelled.

In practice each one of us has to work with those people with whom his daily life brings him into contact. The comrade in the country must sow the seed in the minds of farmers. The middle-class comrade must do more or less missionary work in his own class. The Wall Street comrade (and there are some) must work with the brokers. The professional man must preach the Good News to Intellectuals.

But the agitator who is in a position to select his field of work, and is anxious to get the largest possible results from his labor **MUST** work with the Industrial Proletariat. Until the Proletariat is far more thoroughly organized than it is to-day propaganda among farmers and others must be merely incidental to our main work — the organization of those whom Capitalism and the Machine Process have prepared to receive our message. If this position is correct, the question of what are the best methods of propaganda resolves itself into the question: What are the best methods of reaching the industrial worker?

Many of us who are doing the work came from other classes, so we must avoid generalizing hastily from our own individual experiences. It does not follow that the pamphlets and books that led to our "conversion" will influence workingmen. The chances are they will not. I tried to show in an essay on "The Biogenetic Law" printed in this Review a few months ago that the road to Socialism followed by the professional or Middle Class man is very different from that followed by the workingman. The former is apt to become enamored of a beautiful picture of the Society of the Future, and will be greatly influenced by literature of the Ruskin-Morris-Blatchford type pointing out the utter hideousness of what the world calls Civilization. The workingman has no particular fancy for beautiful pictures — pipe-dreams he calls them — of the Future. He does not care much whether civilization is pretty or hideous. He is deeply conscious that he — John Jones, workingman — is not getting what his beloved President has taught him to call a "square deal." He has read Arthur Brisbane and Theodore Roosevelt and he is inclined to blame the "criminal malefactors of great wealth" for his unhappy condition. He thus has class-hatred. With him then our task is to make that our starting-point and turn this class-hatred (for which we are in no way responsible) into intelligent Socialist Class Consciousness; and for this purpose we must use straight and simple Class Struggle literature like A. M. Simon's "Man Under the Machine", Marx's "Wage-Labor and Capital," Gaylord Wilshire's "Why a Workingman Should be a Socialist," the four Kautsky Pamphlets, Vail's "The Mission of the Working-Class" and Lassalle's

"Workingman's Programme." It is very difficult to get away from the idea that the literature that influenced us must influence every one else. In writing my "What's Wrong" article for the November Book Bulletin I recommended "Merrie England," a book that at one time greatly influenced me. The only criticisms of that article I have had have been letters from proletarians expressing surprise and amazement at that particular recommendation.

Of course in a city audience we always have some hearers that do not belong to the working class, but I do not believe it is necessary for the agitator to modify his doctrine in the slightest to tickle their ears. There are several reasons for this opinion. The first is he is gunning for proletarians; if any of his scattering shot brings down other game well and good, but to reach proletarians should ever be his aim. The second is that if the members of other classes are to become good and useful comrades, they must adopt the proletarian standpoint. Until they do so every old Socialist will agree with me they are a weariness to the flesh, so that we might just as well try to start them right instead of making two bites at a cherry. The third is that it is not at all sure he will be any more likely to get them by giving them what he may think they want than he would by giving them straight working-class Socialism.

I hope it will not be set down to mere vanity if I relate an anecdote from my own experience to illustrate this last point. I remember speaking one summer night in 1900 in La Salle, Illinois. I spoke on a square or vacant lot immediately next to the hotel where I was stopping, to an audience made up wholly or almost wholly of coal-miners. In order to account to them for the extreme irregularity of their employment I tried to explain to them just as simply as I could the Socialist theory of crises. I had no other thought but to make this just as plain as I could to those miners. After I went back to the hotel I sat down on the piazza to smoke a cigar before going to bed. A very well-dressed prosperous-looking man of about fifty came and sat down beside me and introduced himself. He told me he had been selling goods on the road for thirty years, but had never understood until that night why we had periodical hard times when it was difficult to sell goods. He said he had voted for Lincoln and every Republican candidate since, but that now he understood business for the first time in his life, and he was sure I was right. I took him to my room and opened my trunk and sold him about two dollars' worth of Socialist books. This may look at first sight like an exception to the Biogenetic Law, but it is not. His experience as a drummer had prepared his mind

to receive the Socialist theory of crises. But, if because I had noticed a few well-dressed men on the hotel porch, I had changed my talk and painted lovely visions of the Co-operative Commonwealth and dwelt on the hideousnesses of life to-day I would have reached neither the coal-miners I was after nor the drummer whom I got by chance.

For the next year many of the workingmen whom we want to reach will be out of work. Those who are employed will live in constant dread of losing their jobs. To reach them we must explain to them why their jobs are so precarious, in other words we must explain to them why crises are inevitable under the wage-system. During the year 1908 the Socialist agitator should always devote his first speech in a town to this subject, and he should be armed with at least three copies of Bellamy's "Parable of the Water-Tank" or Joe Wanhope's splendid leaflet, "A Tip for the Jobless Man," to give away. He should also have several sample copies of "Wilshire's Magazine," the "Appeal to Reason" and the "Chicago Daily Socialist" and should get just as many subscriptions to these as possible. This is just as important as good speaking. Whenever possible the agitator should have at least three nights in a town. Then, on the second night he could explain more fully the fundamental class conflict, and on the third night could show the Class character of the State and the consequent necessity of working-class political action. It is almost impossible to cover these three points in a single speech, but where the agitator has only one night in the town he must make the attempt though he must give most of his time to the causes of panics.

While our constant aim must be to carry the Good News to the industrial proletariat, there is no reason why we should not use special means to reach others whenever we can do so without neglecting our main work. For instance it would be a good plan for every travelling agitator to carry a few copies of the "Christian Socialist" to give to the ministers in the towns he visits. But for us Socialists the Proletariat is a necessity: other classes are superfluities. A witty comrade recently wrote me that of late years the Socialist Party in its eagerness to reach farmers and others seemed to have adopted the saying of a character in one of Oscar Wilde's stories who remarked that the "only things we could not get along without were the superfluities."

The New Year of 1908 is bringing to us American Socialists the greatest and most golden opportunities that men could wish for. Let us rise to the occasion! Let us forget our petty differences! All those who hope for the Co-operative Commonwealth and believe in the political action of the

working-class as a means to reach it are comrades and ought to work together harmoniously. What matters it if one believes in immediate demands and another does not; if one believes in Industrial Unionism and another does not; if one is a Christian Socialist and another is a materialist with a heart burning with love for the despised proletariat? There are enough things that we all believe in to unite us indissolubly in the bonds of that Comradeship which "suffereth long" and "is not easily provoked."

If we prove equal to the opportunity, if our love for each other and for the Proletariat swells into a flood mighty enough to sweep away our petty differences and our petty personal aims, then the Panic of 1907-1908 will be the last panic that America will ever see, and you and I will live to see grow up a generation of children unable to understand or realize the Night Mare of Poverty and the Hell of Competition.

"Hear a ward, a word in season, for the day is drawing nigh,
"When the Cause shall call upon us, some to live and some to die!"

ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE.

New Canaan, Conn., Jan. 13, 1908.

Benjamin Kidd's Religious Interpretation of History.

ALL STUDENTS of social questions of any penetration have observed the backward condition of sociology. Kidd observed this and bewailed it all the more as he believed himself destined to change it.

The manner in which he sets about his task is full of promise. He is an implicit believer in biological science. He knows why sociology is at sea. It is because the sociologist has not paid sufficient attention to biology and its methods. His book "Social Evolution" contains no finer passage than the one in which he expresses this idea: "By these sciences which deal with human society it seems to have been for long forgotten that in that society we are merely regarding the highest phenomena in the history of life, and that consequently all departments of knowledge which deal with social phenomena have their true foundations in the biological sciences." How Kidd could begin so well and end by describing all progress in terms of religion we shall see later.

Since there is a lengthy chapter about the middle of the book, explaining the danger of Socialism, we are more than a little surprised to find the following on the second page of the volume.

"Despite the great advances which science has made during the past century in almost every other direction, there is, it must be confessed, no science of human society properly so called.

"What knowledge there is exists in a more or less chaotic state scattered under many heads; and it is not improbably true, however much we may hesitate to acknowledge it, that the generalizations which have recently tended most to foster a conception of the unity of underlying laws operating amid the complex social phenomena of our time, have not been those which have come from the orthodox scientific school. They have rather been those advanced by that school of social revolutionists, of which Karl Marx is the most commanding figure."

Kidd is a thorough Darwinian; he is an admirer of Weismann and accepts his views; he is thoroughly convinced that the theories of these two great savants are destined to prove the salvation of sociology.

There are two rather grave deficiencies however, in Kidd's

biological education. He worked out his theory too early to get the benefit of Krapotkin's "Mutual Aid" and De Vries' "Mutation." Had he looked up even the earlier of Krapotkin's articles, which were then appearing in the *Nineteenth Century Review*, he would probably have had less to say about the "ceaseless and inevitable struggle and competition" which seem to him to be in operation always and everywhere.

He rejects, of course, the old cataclysmic geology, and magnifies the slowness of evolution, after the fashion of the Darwinians of twenty years ago. Could he have known of De Vries' experiments and their results he might have modified his views about the "slowness" of organic evolution.

He is quite positive that the fundamental law of social progress can be found in Darwinian science as he knows it, and he plunges boldly in. The search is brief and successful; he finds it at the very threshold. It is nothing less than Darwin's great principle of natural selection. In the lower forms of organic life the inferior members are sacrificed so that the few superior individuals might alone propagate and thus preserve the highest possible efficiency of the species. If the struggle for existence could be suspended here, the inferior as well as the superior would propagate, therefore the progress of the species would cease and almost immediately, degeneracy would set in. It is clear then that progress among these lower creatures is due to the struggle for existence in which the unfit are invariably weeded out in the interest of a few superiors.

Kidd lifts this theory bodily over into the domain of human society. Here it means that the mass of men must consent, in the interests of progress, to be driven to the wall in order that a few more excellent individuals may be selected to rule society and keep it at the maximum of efficiency. Had Kidd known how thoroughly Krapotkin proved his case in his contention of the superiority of mutual aid against mutual struggle as a factor in progress, his confidence in his own theory would have been much less pronounced. Then he would have known that as we rise in the organic scale co-operation usually takes the place of competition to an ever increasing degree. Even though Kidd overlooks this or fails to appreciate its force, he still sees a great difference between the lower organic world and human society.

This difference which he sees is the difference between the play of blind, unconscious forces, and the power of human reason. It was precisely this difference which Lester F. Ward observed and made the basis of his sociology. Between Kidd and Ward the contrast is complete. Ward believes that future progress depends on the increased use of reason; Kidd be-

lieves such a course would be fraught with disaster, and that progress depends on our not meddling with the forces of nature in general and the struggle for existence in particular. Huxley maintained that those societies are most nearly perfect in which "the struggle for existence is most strictly limited." Darwin said: "Those communities which included the greatest number of sympathetic members would flourish best and rear the greatest number of offspring." Krapotkin even disputes the value of struggle among animals, asserting that even here "no progressive evolution of the species can be based upon periods of keen competition." This is a phase of evolution which never came within Kidd's limited vision — unfortunately for his whole theory.

Kidd therefore takes the astounding position that the continuance of human progress depends on the mass of men refusing to use their reason for the alleviation of present hardships. He concedes that for men in society to continue the bitter struggle for existence is contrary to reason. He admits also that the possession of reason gives men the power to suspend or abolish that struggle. Why then do they not abolish it? It is Kidd's answer to this pertinent question which constitutes the foundation of his system.

In the first place, if they did progress would cease. His interesting chapter on the "Conditions of Human Progress" is devoted to the development of this theory. We are presented with a resumé of the history of man which might well have been written in answer to Krapotkin's treatment of the same theme in "Mutual Aid." He says of man: "Looking back through the glasses of modern science we behold him at first outwardly a brute, feebly holding his own against many fierce competitors." And again: "Looking back through the history of life anterior to man, we find it to be a record of ceaseless progress on the one hand and ceaseless stress and competition on the other. This orderly and beautiful world which we see around us is now, and always has been, the scene of incessant rivalry between all the forms of life inhabiting it — rivalry too, not chiefly conducted between different species but between members of the same species. The plants in the green sward beneath our feet are engaged in silent rivalry with each other, a rivalry which if allowed to proceed without outside interference would know no pause until the weaker were exterminated." And, he concludes, "Other things being equal, the wider the limits of selection, the keener the rivalry, and the more rigid the selection, the greater will be the progress." When Kidd comes to human society he still sees this "rivalry" unabated. "It is necessary to keep the mind fixed on a single feature of man's history,

namely, the stress and strain under which his development proceeds. His societies, like the individuals comprising them, are to be regarded as the product of the circumstances in which they exist, — the survivals of the fittest in the rivalry which is constantly in progress." The divergence between Kidd and Krapotkin is not as to the struggle between societies, though even here there is some difference, but in that Krapotkin maintains that victory falls to those societies which most thoroughly suspend the struggle and competition within their own borders, while Kidd holds the exact opposite.

However this controversy may be ultimately decided, it cannot be denied that existing society, which marks the highest point yet reached in the history of civilization, is still rami-fied with the struggle for existence between the majority of its members. And Kidd freely acknowledges that this struggle is responsible for that appalling poverty which is the despair of all reformers. There is no disposition on his part to gloss this over. He is, on the other hand, anxious to prove its existence and produces witnesses of great importance. He is careful to show that the demand for improvement is not limited to demagogues. Although Huxley opposed Individualism and Socialism both, he was heartily sick of things as they are. He said: "Even the best of modern civilizations appears to me to exhibit a condition of mankind which neither embodies any worthy ideal nor even possesses the merit of stability. I do not hesitate to express the opinion that if there is no hope of a large improvement of the condition of the greater part of the human family; if it is true that the increase of knowledge, the winning of a greater dominion over nature which is its consequence, and the wealth which follows upon that dominion are to make no difference in the extent and intensity of want with its concomitant physical and moral degradation among the masses of the people, I should hail the advent of some kindly comet which would sweep the whole affair away." Again Huxley says:

"What profits it to the human Prometheus that he has stolen the fire of heaven to be his servant, and that the spirits of the earth and air obey him; if the vulture of Pauperism is eternally to tear his very vitals and keep him on the brink of destruction?"

And Kidd himself puts this question into the mouth of the Socialists:

"The adherents of the new faith ask, What avails it that the waste places of the earth have been turned into the highways of commerce, if the many still work and want and only the few have leisure and grow rich? What does it profit the worker that knowledge grows if all the appliances of science

are not to lighten his labor? Wealth may accumulate, and public and private magnificence may have reached a point never before attained in the history of the world; but wherein is society the better, it is asked, if the Nemesis of poverty still sits like a hollow-eyed spectre at the feast?"

It was the observance of these terrible conditions which led John Stuart Mill to say that if he had to choose "between communism with all its chances and the present state of society with all its sufferings and injustices..... all the difficulties, great and small, of communism would be but as dust in the balance."

Kidd is willing to acknowledge that the demand for the abolition of this struggle for existence and its consequent poverty is reasonable and that Socialism would abolish it.

He says: "It is necessary, if we would understand the nature of the problem with which we have to deal, to disabuse our minds of the very prevalent idea that the doctrines of socialism are the heated imaginings of unbalanced brains. They are nothing of the kind; they are the truthful, unexaggerated teaching of sober reason."

He also regards the critics of Socialism as having failed to meet its arguments: "No greater mistake can be made than to suppose," says he, "that the arguments of these writers have been effectively answered in that class of literature which is usually to be met with on the other side."

He not only admits but contends that: "The lower classes of our population have no sanction from their reason for maintaining existing conditions."

Even if the abolition of the struggle for existence, with its consequent poverty, should result, as Kidd claims, in the cessation of progress and the sufferers knew it would bring that result, would that knowledge alone be enough to restrain them from so doing? Kidd himself thinks not. He thinks any such supposition unreasonable. In his estimation men are not influenced by such remote considerations. He quotes Mallock who asks: "Do any of us deny ourselves a single scuttle of coals so as to make our coalfields last one more generation?" Of course not. Future generations will know how to keep warm without our worrying about it.

This then is the problem as it presents itself to Kidd: If the working class, by using its reason and adopting Socialism, could thereby abolish its poverty and misery, and the only penalty would be a remote one, and it is not really influenced by remote considerations, why does not the working class act in the matter and secure emancipation from present ills? This is the question which rises in the minds of Mr. Kidd's readers with increasing persistence.

It is indeed to Kidd himself a great mystery, and once more history repeats itself — mystery becomes the mother of religion. Kidd explains that this unreasonable, inexplicable submission of the working class is the handiwork of religion. How can it be explained otherwise? If the phenomenon is not natural it must be supernatural. If it is not reasonable it must be religious.

Now that the theory comes into full view, we perceive that it is simply a modernized revival of the "categorical imperative" of Emanuel Kant — that our duty, no matter how difficult or distasteful, must be regarded as the will of God.

Before we go further with our analysis let us follow Kidd in his pitiful efforts to interpret history by means of this precious principle.

In the ancient world, before christianity appeared, the lower classes were always crushed without mercy whenever they attempted to improve their miserable lot. This was because the ruling class acted according to the dictates of reason only and were not influenced by considerations of religion. The great and, as it appears to Kidd, the only religion, christianity not having appeared yet, it is difficult to see how they could have been. After the advent of christianity however it is another story. At the close of the Roman Empire chattel slavery disappeared. This must have been because the slaves revolted, although the records are not very explicit. But now the ruling class, instead of putting down the rebellion in a sea of blood, surrenders. This is due to the action of christianity which has by this time generated and conserved an "immense fund of altruistic feeling" which by "softening the character" of the slave-owners made them unwilling to vigorously defend the institution which gave property rights in human flesh.

The abolition of that atavistic revival of chattel slavery which covered the Southern states was accomplished by the teaching of "The doctrine of salvation and the doctrine of the equality of all men before the Deity," and not by the action of reason, for neither of these doctrines are founded in reason, but in faith — as Mr. Kidd sees it. This religious interpretation of history is altogether too shallow and unreal to call for any extended criticism, but one might remark in passing that it hardly jibes with Mr. Kidd's view that this Southern slave-owning class which had its "character softened" by the influence of religious teaching until it surrendered, should only do so after a bloody and prolonged struggle and when surrender was by no means a matter of choice. Our philosopher stoutly maintains that any ruling class must be victorious unless its blows are half-hearted through the influence of

religion. Mr. Kidd does not possess the historical vision to be able to perceive that this Southern ruling class was measuring blades, not with its slaves but, with a Northern ruling class, and although this Northern ruling class had also experienced the benign influences of religion there was no apparent weakness in its blows.

Kidd would probably have explained this, had he perceived it, by the justice of their cause, for it is hardly likely that so purblind a thinker would have seen that the brave Northerner was only defending another slave system of his own.

The French revolution is to Kidd not a struggle between two robber classes but a struggle between the rulers and the people. The hearts and characters of the ruling classes had been affected — "softened" — by "the great body of humanitarian feeling which had been slowly accumulating" through the influence of religion. "It was in the hearts of these classes," says the ingenuous Kidd, "and not in the streets, that the cause of the people was won." And so it came to pass that the French ruling class, humanitarianized and heart-softened by religion, gave in — after a fierce and sanguinary fight.

We are not surprised to find after this that Kidd is opposed to Socialism. Of his numerous objections only one is vital to his system. That is, that Socialism would suspend the struggle for existence, thereby abolishing that operation of natural selection which he regards as the prime cause of all progress.

It is enough to say here that the idea of the demoralizing struggle for existence, which curses existing society, being necessary to future progress, is an ideological phantasm of Kidd's bourgeois brain; it has no essential place in modern positive science. As to whether this struggle, as it now exists, secures the survival of those who are fittest in any socially desirable sense. I have fully covered the point in my "Reply to Haeckel" in "Evolution, Social and Organic."

When Kidd sees the exploited working class subordinating its own present interests to the future interests of the race his mind is playing him a scurvy trick — a trick which has victimized better men than Kidd. What he conceives to be the future interests of the human race are nothing more than the sublimated, idealized interests of the present ruling class. What Kidd's position really amounts to at bottom is, that the working class is kept quiet and submissive in the interests of the ruling class, and as this submission is neither sensible nor reasonable, it must be due to religion. When Kidd's philosophy is thus stripped of its metaphysical trappings there is a great deal to be said in its favor.

It will hardly do however, in the twentieth century, to give the sole credit for the continued subjugation of the working class to religion. It may be freely conceded that this curbing of the oppressed class in society has always been the main function of all religions. It is from this point of view that Ruskin, speaking as one of the well-to-do, defines the English national religion as: "The performance of church ceremonies, and the preaching of soporific truths (or untruths) to keep the mob quietly at work while we amuse ourselves." In earlier times, before science had demoralized theology, religion was able to accomplish this result almost unassisted.

There is also a considerable grain of truth in Kidd's contention that this repression was of service to the race, distasteful as this may be to the average free-thinker.

It is a well known and essential tenet of the evolutionary philosophy that the mere existence of anything proves it to have some real place in the general scheme of things, and that which has existed for centuries must have had some useful function to perform. Even chattel slavery may be successfully defended on this ground. The reason why the Red Indian cannot adapt himself to European civilization is probably to be found in the fact that his race has not been subjected to those long centuries of slavery and serfdom which has developed in the white races that capacity for sustained and continuous labor which is indispensable to modern civilization.

In so far as religion assisted in that painful discipline by promising fantastic and visionary rewards in some future cloud-land, thus rendering the slavery more endurable, it has functioned usefully in the development of society. While this may justify religion in the past, it is hardly a good reason for its preservation in the future, and it is encouraging that only an insignificant handful of very poorly informed Socialists consider it worth while to spend their energies bolstering up exploded superstitions which are useful only in a slave society. That this is the real function of religious belief, the ruling class has always been quick to apprehend. A fine example of this appeared in the German parliament when Mr. Windhorst, member of the Clerical Party, appealed to the bourgeois legislators not to encourage the spread of irreligion among the masses. In a moment of anger, he forgot the listening Social Democrats and the listening world. Said he: "When the people lose their faith they will no longer bear their intolerable misery, they will rebel." This is really what Kidd took three hundred pages to say.

Those who, accepting this view, conclude that free-thought is sufficient to accomplish the liberation of the work-

ing class, are the victims of a great delusion. The time has long passed when the ruling class depended solely on the priest for the quiescence of their victims. Except among catholics, the priest has ceased to be an effective policeman. The protestant churches no longer contain any considerable proportion of wage workers. The protestant worker has come to recognize the antediluvian nature of biblical teaching and he refuses even to listen to it. When the protestant church conceded the occupant of the pew the right to use his own judgment, it signed its own death-warrant. The catholic church has always seen the danger of this, and it owes its great power among its working men to its logical and consistent policy of refusing to allow them to think for themselves.

In the twentieth century the ruling class has weapons much more effective than the antiquated vaporings of preachers. The newspaper has usurped the functions of the pulpit and this is why editors are well paid while the majority of preachers are almost starving. Now that the preacher cannot "deliver the goods" the capitalist refuses to foot the bills.

Time was when the priest was the most valuable of all the intellectual hirelings of the ruling class, but with capitalism this is not so, for the preacher's method of enslavement destroys the intelligence of the slave and renders him incapable of useful service in a mode of wealth production which requires in its workers an active brain, able to comprehend the complex processes of machine production.

The schoolmaster is able to produce a slave psychology and at the same time develop this necessary intelligence. The editor is able to contribute to the impregnation of the worker's brain with bourgeois ideas, while he preserves his own influence by sprinkling his effusions with scientific ideas.

Therefore the schoolmaster and the editor, and for similar reasons the professor, are rated above the preacher, and the preaching profession is fast becoming a negligible quantity.

In the past week, we have had a notably clear demonstration of this. At a meeting of the Pittsburg Ministerial Union, Jan. 13, '08, the Rev. Joseph Cochrane of Philadelphia delivered himself as follows:

"Ministers are underpaid and the scale of their pay and advancement in the last ten years does not begin to compare with the average hodcarrier."

"Conditions existing to-day in the educational institutions of the country are exactly the reverse of what they were twenty-five or thirty years ago. Where formerly 80 per cent of the students graduated from the great Eastern colleges left

their studies to enter the ministry, while 20 per cent took up the practice of law, medicine or business, of the students graduated by the Eastern universities last year only 2'1-2 per cent were trained for the ministry. This meant only one minister for every twenty-five pupils in the East.

"The majority of students who now enter colleges to study for the ministry leave their studies to take up law, medicine, dentistry or business. The atmosphere of the institutions in which they receive their training is to be lamented.

"In this materialistic age, the dearth of ministers is due, at least to some extent, to the small salaries to be had."

And so Mr. Kidd's theory that religion is alone responsible for the continued submission of the working class is steadily and rather rapidly losing ground, so that propaganda limited to modern liberalism — free-thought — has already become an anachronism. Capitalism has filled its armory with intellectual weapons that are more effective because more modern. Among its choicest are the press and the lecture platform. The workers are beginning to realize more than ever that the only remedy for this is a platform and a press of its own. As this realization becomes more vivid new Socialist platforms are established and Socialist papers are born over-night.

Thus does the working class fight fire with fire. It develops its own social intelligence and promotes a revolutionary psychology; a psychology which grows out of the economic world, the world of real things, freed from superstitions theological and otherwise, a psychology which when it has gathered sufficient force and begins to find mass-expression will relegate to history the last form of economic slavery.

ARTHUR M. LEWIS.

Poetry and the Social Unrest.

TAKE up the latest magazine, read through its scant bits of verse, and see if you can find therein an answer to the canting wail, "Why have we not poets nowadays?" Most of our versifiers—with Byron still echoing in their ears and modern esthetics crowded into some segregated section of their brains—are classical and unashamed. By "classical" I mean stilted, formal, conventional. In the great periods of English literature poetic souls have been touched by song of lark and nightingale, and now the tuneful pair go wailing together thru the verses of Americans whose experience with them has been limited to natural history museums. Keats and Tennyson look as sad in the broken lines of our periodicals as did Virgil and Horace in their eighteenth century couplets.

This goes to show that our "poets" are not genuine. And like unto this truth is the next. Not being genuine they lack the breadth of interest which was characteristic of their great originals. Shelley and Byron, Wordsworth and Tennyson wrote of birds and flowers, of river and mead, but their feeling for landscape beauty, just because it was real, did not stand alone. Any man who cares for bird-song or violet or the infinite stretches of green below and blue above will care most of all for his fellow beings: nothing human will be alien to him. Read over the titles to the poems of any of the men mentioned: see how wide were their sympathies, how far-flashing their hates, how they stood near the center of the world movement of their time. If Shelley penned "To Constantia Singing," we owe to him also a "Song to the men of England," a cry of encouragement "To the Republicans of North America," and a sad stanza which still gives voice to the woes of Ireland. Byron wrote much of love and women, but when the great cry went forth from struggling Greece it was in his trumpet lines that it reached the corners of the earth.

Mind you I am not saying that these men were political or didactic poets, or that poetry should deal largely with passing human struggles. But a great poet must feel the length and breadth, the height and depth of our nature; must be able to speak out of the inmost core of our racial being, out of that soul of us that can perish only with our kind. And how can he know humanity except through the aspirations and defeats, the spiritual rending and tearing and readjusting which he can feel in the society of his own time? The man who lives in this moving,

breathing world of ours blind and deaf to these will never be a poet for all his pretty lines to skylark and nightingale.

But our versifiers do not speak out of the heart of their time or of any time. Not strange then appears the fact that the great social unrest of the twentieth century should find so little echo in their stanzas. In other lands, to be sure, the cry of the proletariat has found eloquent voice in picture and statue and poem; but here in America we are timid and tardy. There are signs, however, of better things to come: what a few years may bring forth no man can tell.

With this in mind the reader may take more than a passing interest in the poems which these paragraphs are designed to introduce. Their author would be the last to claim for them any transcendent qualities. But they deal with a theme of transcendent interest to the readers of THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, and deal with it in a manner which seems to me vigorous and effective. The first two picture forth two of the results of our heartless civilization: the others are a call to us to rise in revolt.

WM. E. BOHN.

WHO DROVE THEM FORTH?

Written on occasion of the lay-off of ten thousand employees of the
Union Pacific Railroad.

The frost-king howls his frenzy down the skies,
The scraggling pines like spears point to the south;
And huddled there in the mountain's gaping mouth,
A countless herd of starving cattle dies.

Only the shadows hear their shuddering cries,
As hungry coyotes tear their helpless shanks;
Only the snows in blizzard-driven banks
Can sense where, winding, rough, the black trail lies.

Who drove them forth? Where doth God's finger point?
Let quail these cruel and cowardly souls, for now,
My fellows, will we make the tyrants bow,
And doubly cruel, will rend them joint and joint.

Loud howl the winter winds, low hangs the sky;
Helpless the cattle starve,—they can but die!

Eric Dale.

A MACHINE-MADE SONG.

The crush of the city is in my heart
Like the voice of a long North night,
And fear-spent eyes like an icy dart
Chill my own sick heart with fright.
'T is a fear of the end, of the flitting years,
Of a time when smiles are few;
When my own spent eyes are a mist of tears,
And all life is bitter rue.
'T is a dreary fight, 't is a fight to death,
Yet the heart cries out in a sobbing breath,
"Fight on!"

The crush of the city is in my breast
Like the surge of a turbulent sea;
The hopeless hurry, the white unrest
Blast the hope in the heart of me:—
What use to toil with a nerveless hand
In a day so blight with woe?
And how may the hope of an Afterland
Steal the sting of the world we know,
When the end so near is fraught with death?—
Yet the heart cries out in a sobbing breath,
"Fight on!"

The crush of the city is hushed and still,
But the darkness is a-flare
With the flashing lights from a tireless mill,
Which hums in the slumbrous air.—
Grind on, you wheels, till the remnant soul
Is lost in the rattle and hate!
Toil on, you men, till the funeral toll
Sounds the last cold knell of Fate!
For we're all in the fight. 't is a fight to death,
And we all will sob in the last short breath,
"Fight on!"

Eric Dale

DOWN WITH THE AUTOCRATS!

Could I but have the hungry flesh-red lash
That Cheops wielded from his pyramid,
And all the hate which from his living-dead
Flashed up in fire to wither to slow ash;

Could I but have the sinew and the brawn
On which that brute insatiate lash was fed,
And all the hope those flouted armies bled
That stone might vaunt when Egypt's might were gone;

Could I but have them all, just these,—ah then,
My fellows, would I flay the vultures red
Who glut more life-blood than e'er Cheops did,
And lash till their gaunt hearts were those of men!

Come! Drive the damned tyrants from their shade,
And taste the sweets your own long labor made!

Eric Dale.

THE SLEEPING SLAVES.

With silent stealth these hideous birds of power,
From fevered mires and fens of lustful greed,
Like vultures swarm to pillage and to bleed,
And frighten slaves to wheedle and to cower.

With songs of tinsel'd lust they tone the hour,
Soft wily cries the myriad slaves enfold;
Yet we sleep on, dream all our tinsel gold,
Nor wake to find all rancid, rank, and sour.

What are we men that on starvation feed
When mellow fruit bleeds in their dripping claws?
Come, sluggards, rise! List to their coarse guffaws
Mock our inaction, misery, and need!

Rend wing and wing these vultures and their like;
Come! Wake from this black lethargy and strike!

Eric Dale.

The Economic Aspects of the Negro Problem.

I. The Negro Slave in Colonial Times.

The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line, the relation of the darker to the lighter races, says Professor Du Bois, a prominent member of the colored race. While his descent must naturally influence the writer quoted to somewhat exaggerate the importance of the problem, and while we socialists will never be disposed to admit that any problem may overshadow in importance the problem of labor, yet the fact that some ten millions, or one eighth of our population, are at least likely to take the point of view of Professor Du Bois, and that these ten millions are mostly proletarians, and that to them this would be a true statement of fact, no matter what we think of it, must force us socialists to admit that there is at least a great deal of truth in this assertion. Curiously enough, this general recognition of the acuteness of the negro problem dates from the beginning of the current century. Since the now famous luncheon of President Roosevelt with Mr. Booker Washington, in the latter part of 1901, — an incident trivial enough in itself, but characteristic for the unanimous cry of protest throughout the entire South, from Maryland to Florida, and from the shores of the Atlantic to the farthest Texas,—animated discussions were started not only in the North, but even in Europe, as to the future of the Negro Race in America. It is no less curious, that while it is generally understood that the vast majority of the negroes in this country belong to the proletarian class, nevertheless the party which claims to represent the interest of this class has troubled itself very little about the negro problem. A few articles in the pages of the *International Socialist Review*, and other Socialist publications, some quite sensible and some otherwise, was all that the socialists have contributed to the discussion of this grave problem, as if their assertion, often heard, that the negro problem was only one aspect of the labor problem, relieved them of the necessity of studying it, instead of making it their especial duty. It is not at all surprising therefore, to find a universal lack of understanding of the complicated aspects of this problem among the working socialists, coupled with a wide spread lack of interest anywhere outside of the southern socialist organizations. Instead of a painstaking study, and some well formed convictions and policies, we find only antiquated pre-

judices among some, and a purely platonic sympathy to the poor negroes among others. Do the Socialists of this country really expect to attract the ten million negro proletarians into their ranks with such a policy of indifference? Or do they really think they can succeed in this country with these ten millions of proletarians left on the outside? Or do they simply sit and wait, until the International Socialist congress will take up this momentous question, just as they were willing to leave the entire question of immigration alone to be discussed by the comrades from the countries of Europe?

The series of studies, of which this is the first installment, is not offered with the conceited notion, that it will entirely fill the existing gap. There is no pretense, that an absolutely correct answer will be given to the negro problem, which will be adopted as our plank by the time the next national convention meets for the selection of its candidates, and the formulation of its platform. Our purpose will be realized, if we shall succeed in showing some of the historical and economic aspects of this problem, and shall make the average socialist worker somewhat better acquainted with the nature of the problem, so as to give some solid foundation upon which to construct his theories and remedial proposals. Books there have been written many about the negro problem, but not only are the socialist writers conspicuous by their absence in this literature, but very few efforts have ever been made, at least in this country, to apply the methods of economic interpretation to the past and the present of the negro's position in this country. For it is true, though scarcely flattering to our national conceit, that the few really scientific studies of the history of the negro race in this country have been contributed by German students, and I hope to do a useful service to the cause, if I do no more than acquaint the American socialists with the interesting results of these investigations.

I have stated above that the beginning of the twentieth century has brought with it a marked aggravation of the negro problem. Still, it was evident to any painstaking observer of American life, that no sudden change in the relation of the races has taken place and that the seeming aggravation of the conditions was but a manifestation of effects which were gathering for a very long time. For no matter what the future may have in store for us, in the past the negro question, like the poor, we had with us always. And any serious discussion of the negro question is absolutely useless which does not take the historical conditions into thorough consideration.

What is the negro problem? In other words, what facts of American life justify us in speaking of its existence? In brief, it is this: That ten millions of men and women of negro,

or semi-negro origin are forced, against their will, and much to their dissatisfaction, to live in exceptional legal as well as social conditions, that they are forced to suffer restrictions in their political and civil rights, as well as economic opportunities because of their racial origin. This is not intended as a criticism of the situation, but as a simple statement of facts, for at this stage we are only stating the problem which we intend to study. With the exception of one short period, where the legal, but not the actual standing of the negro was equalized with the rest of the population, the negro problem as defined above, has never ceased to exist since that fateful day when the first fourteen African negroes were brought to Virginia in a small Dutch vessel, in the year of our Lord 1619.

Not only has the negro problem existed in this country since that day, but the presence of the negro has made a deep impression upon the economic, political and social development of this country, and the history of the Negro Problem is no more and no less than the History of the United States, of its politic, economic and social institutions.

No effort will be made to embody the history of this great country in this short series of essays. Nevertheless, it cannot be stated too often, that without some historical study of the negro problem, its nature at the present cannot at all be understood.

The proclamation of emancipation divides this history into two well defined epochs, that of slavery and that of negro freedom. The present negro problem is the problem of the free negro; but an understanding of the free negro, and his problem may only be found in the conditions of slavery, and any discussion of the negro problem, which presumes to begin after the emancipation, is worse than useless, it is misleading.

It seems even strange that it should be necessary to emphasize this fact; but our young and energetic country lives fast, makes its history in a great hurry and therefore forgets as easily. It must always be remembered, therefore, that scarcely more than 40 years have passed since the liberation of the slaves. It follows that almost all the living negroes over forty years of age were born of parents who had been slaves. On the other hand, the white population of the South is no further removed from the institution of slave owning, than the negro is from conditions of previous servitude. The system of slavery is vivid in memories, as an awful nightmare for some, and as a vision of the paradise lost for others. Social relations are even more enduring than personal memories. Much will be cleared up in this tremendous and com-

plicated problem, if the present influences of the only too recent past be constantly kept in mind.

"Vice," says Horace Greeley, "is ever conceived in darkness and cradled in obscurity." This relieves me from the painful necessity of making an effort to contribute to the discussion of the exact date of the origin of negro slavery in the American colonies. In 1619, or 1620, it really makes very little difference which, there arrived in Jamestown, of the colony of Virginia, the Dutch vessel with its human cargo of 14 or 20 negroes, who were sold into slavery to some of the colonies simply followed the tradition of all colonies of the negro problem in this country. But it neither was the beginning of slavery in the American colonies, nor even of negro slavery on the new continent.

For on the one hand, there had existed by that time negro slavery for over one hundred years in the Spanish, Portuguese and Dutch colonies of the American continent, directly transplanted from the African colonies of the same European powers, and on the other hand, the British colonies have also made use of enforced slave labor from the very first days of their existence. How much truth there is in the frequent assertions, that the development of the British colonies in North America would have been impossible without slave labor, it is not necessary to decide here. Nor it is necessary to presume the existence in the British colonies of any special psychological qualities, which have caused this introduction of slavery.

For in accepting the system of involuntary labor these colonies simply followed the tradition of all colonies of the European powers. The economic conditions of the American colonies were extremely favorable to the introduction of slavery or some other system of enforced labor. The enormous supply of free land made the pursuit of agriculture open to every one, as well as exceedingly profitable. Given a practically unlimited supply of free virgin land, the profits of farming was limited only by the scarcity of hired labor, for the new immigrant did not lose much time in turning into an independent farmer. The supply of free hired labor could therefore be but small, and wages of agricultural labor exceedingly high. Side by side with free labor there existed therefore the indentured labor of debtors, often as a means of paying for the cost of transportation to the promised land, and gradually slave labor of the American aborigines and finally of African negroes. Other colonies followed the example of Virginia, and in the early days the northern colonies did not lag much behind the southern settlements. In 1628 negro slavery was introduced in New York and New Jersey, about 1631 in Connecticut, in 1634 in Maryland,

1636 in Delaware, in 1637 in Massachusetts, in 1647 in the Rhode Island colony. In New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and in both Carolinas the exact date of introduction of slavery has not been determined, but it undoubtedly took place during the same period, 1621-1645. These dates leave no doubt, that there was no material difference between the attitude of the northern and southern colonies upon the problem of negro slavery in the beginning of XVII century.

How far the early liberty loving colonists were from any objections against chattel slavery, is well shown by their attitude towards slavery of the American Indians. For many years the number of available negro slaves remained a very limited one; while continuous warfare with the redskins caused a constant stream of war prisoners to flow into the colonial settlements. Since the Anglo-Saxon common law did not recognize the institution of permanent slavery, the helpful colonists, in an early effort at constructive legislation, made use of the Mosaic law, justifying the slavery of war prisoners; and thus early was the bible utilized in justification of this institution.

The system was found to be profitable, and soon systematic stealing of Indians increased the supply of slaves when the number of bona-fide war prisoners was not sufficient to meet the demand. In the beginning of the Eighteenth Century the legal position of the Negro and Indian slaves was identically the same.

But there were many reasons why the slavery of Indians did not reach any considerable dimensions. The wild and liberty loving nature of these prisoners made them little fit for work in the fields, as well as a constant source of danger to the life of the slave owner and his family. The escape of an Indian slave was much easier than the escape of a negro slave, because he was unrecognizable from the many red-skinned friends and allies of the colonists, because of his knowledge of the local geography, and the willingness of the surrounding Indians to assist him in the escape. This made the purchase of an Indian slave a matter of great risk to the pocket of the colonists. And last, but not least, as an institution, Indian slavery greatly disturbed the friendly relations of the colonists with the surrounding Indian tribes. We therefore find, that the importation of new slaves of red skin was prohibited by the Quaker colony of Pennsylvania in 1700, and all the New England colonies during 1712-1715; but traces of Indian slavery persisted in New England until the end of the Eighteenth Century, and still later in the South, though it never was of great importance economically, except that there

was a considerable admixture of Indian blood in the Negro race.

Thus, historic causes have prepared the soil for an exclusively negro slavery, but this process was working out gradually, taking more than a century, probably because of the existence of other sources of involuntary labor. Thus, in Virginia in 1671, there were to be found about 2000 negro slaves, and about 6,000 indentured servants. According to the estimate of the economist Carey, there were imported up into the British colonies from 1619 up to 1714 about 30,000 negroes, and the total number of negro slaves amounted approximately to 58,850, in a white population of 375,750.

In the very beginning of the history of negro slavery in the United States, the natural fitness of the negro for a warmer climate made itself felt. Of the estimated population of 58,850 negroes, 23,000 were in Virginia 3,700 in North Carolina, and 10,500 in South Carolina. Constituting only about 14 per cent. of the total population of the colonies, the negroes of Virginia, were 24 per cent., in North Carolina 33 per cent., and in South Carolina even as much as 62 1-2 per cent., i. e., much more than one-half of the population. It would hardly show a great insight into philosophy of history to look for the causes of the comparatively insignificant number of slaves in New England or the middle colonies in the greater humanitarianism of the population of these colonies, or any theoretical objections to slavery as an institution. For one thing, exceptional and cruel laws against negroes, the slaves as well as the few freedmen, were in the beginning of the eighteenth century no less frequent in the North than in the South. All colonies had passed specially severe penalties for crimes performed by negroes. In New Maryland, according to the law of 1723, a negro who would strike a white man, was subject to penalty of having his ears cut off. In 1741, a white man's house was robbed by negroes; this led to a suspicion of a negro conspiracy, and within 4 months 154 negroes were arrested, of whom 12 negroes were burned and 18 hanged. The most cruel negro code existed in South Carolina, where the negro had to suffer capital punishment for the pettiest larceny, or have his face branded, and his nose pierced. Conditions were not much better in North Carolina.

As was stated above, during the eighteenth century the centre of gravity of the institution of slavery gradually shifted itself towards the negro race, and negro slavery was shifting towards the South. The involuntary labor of the white indentured servants was not a permanent state, sooner or later the indentured servants became free citizens of the colony. The negro slave was not fit to work in the New England

farm, and gradually the negro slaves of the North were concentrated in the cities as the domestic servants. There was hardly a house in Boston without one or two negro servants, and many had as many as five or six. As late as 1719 the Boston papers contained advertisements of sale of negro men, women, and even small negro children.

Thus slavery in the North was rapidly becoming a luxury, and therefore could sooner call forth ethical protests than in the South, where slavery was rapidly becoming an important economic factor. The climate of the Southern field, while more fit for the negro, was at the same time less fit for the white man. The same cause, which stimulated the growth of negro slavery in the South, directed the stream of white immigration towards the North. Later, the very growth of the negro population in the South began to limit the immigration of white colonists into the southern colonies. The supply of free labor therefore grew in the North, and fell in the South, so that through the action of these forces, slavery was becoming less profitable in the North, and more necessary in the South. As long as tobacco was the main crop of the South white labor could still compare with negro labor. But with the development of rice and indigo culture in the low lands, the white population of the South began to avoid farm work more and more.

Gradually the conviction grew, that field work in the southern farms was not at all a fit occupation for the white man. In consequence the importation of African negroes in the middle of the eighteenth century grew to enormous dimensions. From 1715 to 1754 the number of negro slaves increased from 58,900 to 260,000 and in 1776 their number equaled about 500,000, of which 430,000 were located in Virginia, Maryland and the two Carolinas. Rapidly, the negro question was becoming a southern question.

But is there, at this stage of the story, any justification for the use of this word "problem?" In view of the growing dependence of the white population of the South upon the institution of slavery, it did not call forth any questions in the South.

How the white population of the South viewed the institution of slavery, how it justified it, and brought it in harmony with its political theories and ideals (at this period of radical political fermentation, and preparation for the revolution) with its religious beliefs and with all those humanitarian tendencies, so characteristic of the middle of the eighteenth century, — those are all very interesting historical and philosophical questions which have been much less studied, than the economic or the political aspect of slavery. This is especi-

ally true in regard to the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries. For the necessity to defend the institution of slavery from the attacks of the Northerners arose a great many years later, and then this necessity created a vast literature.

But those opinions and views of the South and even of the North upon the slavery question during the 17th and the 18th centuries are very important, for these opinions have undoubtedly contributed a great deal towards shaping the future course of the negro problem for many years to come.

I have before me a very large volume, of modern literary make, bearing the sensational title, "The Negro a beast."

The author of this volume is a fanatic of modern days, hailing from St. Louis, far from the centers of the Black belt; and with the assistance of many quotations from the Bible, and other scriptures, biological and other scientific authorities, he endeavors to prove that the Negro is not a human being at all, but a beast created according to the image of man, with power of speech and human hands.

From these facts the natural deduction is made that the Negro was created by the Almighty for the very explicit purpose of serving the white man. The work often reads like the delirious talk of a very ill man, but as a matter of fact the book was taken quite seriously even in our day by the civilized American public. This is shown by the startling fact that it was dignified by numerous replies from the pens of many noted clergymen, and publicists, who take great pains, to demonstrate, again with the assistance of the Holy scriptures, that the Negro is a human being, though one of a special, lower order, truly created to be a servant of the white man.

It is true that we are dealing here with opinions expressed in the beginning of the twentieth century, but in reality these are but manifestations of atavistic repetition of the opinions universally held in the 17th and the 18th centuries.

Many reasons explain, if they do not justify, the origin of such views upon the nature of the Negro during the early history of slavery in this country. The absence of even a rudimentary anthropological science, especially among the colonists who were people of a very limited educational standard, and the scanty supply of ethnological information, must have necessarily led the early colonists towards making an estimate of the strange race entirely upon the basis of external phenomena of the stage of culture in which they lived; for that matter, many supposedly educated people may be found to-day, who do not suspect the presence of any other

criteria of the anthropological worth of other races than their own.

The Negroes, who arrived in America, were half naked, wild from fear and danger, chained, could not be understood, and did not understand the language spoken to them; they did therefore resemble beasts more than man in the eyes of the uneducated colonists. "Whether the Creator originally formed these black people a little lower than other men, or that they have left their intellectual power through disuse, I will not assume the province of determining but certain it is, that a **new Negro** (as those lately imported from Africa are called) is a complete definition of indolent stupidity Their stupidity does not however allow us to consider them as beasts for our use"

If those were the opinions of an English Missionary, it is not difficult to guess what the prevailing views among the American colonists were.

Here undoubtedly "The wish was father to the thought." And soon the South was taking measures to keep the Negroes in that condition of ignorance and heathenism which served as evidence of their racial inferiority. In many colonies the teaching of Negroes and their conversion to Christianity was strictly prohibited. The multiplicity of laws aiming at the prevention of the awakening of Negro revolts and insurrections in the middle of the 18th century shows that the Southern slave owners were beginning to fear the possibility of the development of human feelings and desires in the Negro beast's breasts. And finally the rapid increase in the number of Mulattoes notwithstanding the many prohibitions of marriages between the White and the Black, seemed to be a living refutation of the theory of the beastly origin of the Negro. When the system of slavery has accomplished the changes in the common law, according to which the place of the child in the society was determined by the position of his father, and the children of slave women were recognized as slaves, the production of Mulattoes became a very profitable undertaking. A Mulatto slave represented a much greater value than a plain Negro. Since the female slaves were at the disposal of the slave owners without any restrictions, the owning of one's own children as slaves became a matter of common every day occurrence in the Southern colonies.

(Continued.)

Immigration at Stuttgart.

THE resolution on Immigration adopted by our last International Congress has called forth a discussion of this subject in our press which could have been more apropos before the Congress, but ought to be welcomed even at this late date. It is unfortunate, however, that the discussion has assumed a somewhat personal character. Our Party's delegates at Stuttgart have been criticized for neglect of duty in not pressing the "American" point of view. It is quite natural that I should be criticized more than any other delegate, and should feel the general criticism more keenly, because I not only "failed and neglected" to press this point of view, but actually opposed it, doing my level best to defeat the resolution proposed by our National Committee. That my position should be criticized was to be expected and I am not surprised to find Comrade Hillquit, the author of the ill-fated resolution, complain of me, although he refrains, in very comrade-like fashion, from openly criticizing me. But there is no mistaking the temper in which the following passage which I quote from Comrade Hillquit's article in *The Worker*, was written: "When it came to a vote,—says Comrade Hillquit,—we found that on the particular point in issue we could probably count on the support of Australia and South Africa, each represented by one delegate, as against almost 900 delegates representing the other twenty-two countries. And what was worse, the American delegation was by no means a unit on our proposed resolution: The Socialist Labor Party had naturally taken the extreme impossibilist view of opposing not only all restrictions of labor immigration, but also all safeguards against the dangers arising from it, and even among the delegates of our own party there were those who were opposed to all restrictions, and refused to be bound by our own resolution on the subject."

I feel therefore in duty bound to inform the comrades of the reasons which actuated me in the course which I adopted at Stuttgart, and incidentally to state just what happened at the Congress, as Comrade Hillquit's article in *The Worker* leaves much to be desired on these points both in clearness and accuracy. Comrade Hillquit makes a labored attempt to create the impression that the "American" Resolution was not rejected in toto and that the resolution actually adopted was a compromise. What actually happened was quite different: our resolution *was rejected in toto* "on the particular point in issue," by the over-

whelming vote of the other twenty-two countries, and there was no thought of a compromise. Comrade Hillquit makes out the semblance of a compromise by simply misstating the position of the other comrades, including my own, on the subject. Not only that: he even misstates the meaning of our own resolution, although it is his own handiwork and he ought to know it. According to Comrade Hillquit (in the Worker) our resolution is not opposed to "involuntary" or "natural" labor migration, but merely to the "importation" of foreign labor. It follows of necessity that those who were opposed to this resolution must have been in favor of such *importation*. And Comrade Hillquit is not slow to draw this conclusion: so he states in one place that the "extreme left" at the Congress "stood for absolutely free labor migration without any restriction or even safeguard," (whatever that may mean). And in another: "even among the delegates of our own party, there were those who were opposed to all restrictions." This statement evidently referring to myself. The compromise, according to him, consisted in the congress expressing itself for the exclusion of "contract-labor."

A mere recapitulation of the facts as Comrade Hillquit would have us understand them shows that he must be mistaken somewhere. For, the following very pertinent questions naturally suggest themselves: 1st. How is it possible that at a gathering of socialists there should be even an "extreme left" that should be opposed to the prohibition of the importation of contract-labor? And if by some chance such "enemies of labor" and "reactionaries" smuggled themselves into the Congress and got representation on the Immigration Commission, is it likely that it would have taken the commission two days hard fighting to dispose of them? 2nd. If Comrade Hillquit's statement as to the meaning of our resolution be true, *then our resolution was actually adopted*. Why, then, does he call it a compromise in one place and a defeat in another? Why does Comrade Hillquit complain that "we were beaten, hopelessly beaten." Why does Comrade Berger accuse Comrade Hillquit of being derelict in his duty, instead of hailing him victor? How account for the deluded ones who intimated that our delegation should have bolted the Congress for adopting our resolution? And how does it all harmonize with the statement that "on the particular point in issue" we knocked up against the solid wall of practically all of the socialists of the rest of the world?

The truth of the matter is as follows: There was no such "extreme left" at Stuttgart that anybody but Comrade Hillquit could see. Certainly there were none among our party's delegates at Stuttgart who were opposed to legislation excluding "imported" immigrants. And there was no compromise at Stuttgart on the immigration question, either, for there was nobody

to compromise with except the supporters of our resolution, and they were "hopelessly beaten." The demand for the exclusion of imported contract labor contained in the Stuttgart resolution was not inserted therein as a concession to those in favor of the restriction of immigration, for all those who opposed "restriction" in general were in favor of this particular restriction. There were really no two opinions on the question. This was not the "point in issue," nor any part of it. That lay at another point. Let us see what it was.

Our resolution is drawn in such a way that it not only does violence to all logic, but is extremely treacherous. At first glance it looks innocent enough, and the worst that could be said about it is that it is meaningless. At least one member of our National Executive Committee is known to have been deceived by its innocent-looking meaninglessness into voting for it. How many more members of our National Executive Committee and National Committee were so deceived I have no means of telling. Our European Comrades, however, were not deceived, nor were all our delegates. They detected the "nigger in the woodpile," and that raised the issue between our delegation and the rest of the world, the debate over which lasted in committee for two whole days, and ended in our being "hopelessly beaten." Yes, ignominiously beaten. It was the attempt of our resolution to establish the principle of dividing immigrants along racial lines into "organizable" and "unorganizable," and to lay down as a rule of socialist policy, based on such principle of division, the demand for the exclusion of the so-called "unorganizable races." On this issue our resolution met with the solid opposition of the socialists of the world with the exception of a few trade-unions. And there was no compromise: the resolution is as emphatic on this point as it could possibly be made. Not, however, because our European comrades have no careful regard for the fate of the American workingmen or their indifference to the fortunes of the socialist movement in America. But from a conviction, fully justified, that the principles and demands formulated in our resolution are a snare and a delusion, and cannot possibly result in any permanent good to the working-class of this country or of the world. These principles and demands are unsocialistic, that is to say, they are repugnant to the permanent and lasting interests of the workingclass.

That this is so, and that Comrade Hillquit saw it in that light at Stuttgart, is proven by the fact that Comrade Hillquit was finally moved to make a speech in favor of the resolution as adopted by the committee. To be frank about it: I was at first surprised to hear Comrade Hillquit speak in favor of the resolution reported by the committee, particularly in view of the fact that nobody opposed it. But as I stood there listening to his

speech I saw the reason for it. Comrade Hillquit saw that the introduction of the resolution sadly damaged the reputation of our movement in the eyes of the socialist world, exposing us to the suspicion of utopianism on the one hand and sordidness of motive and egoism on the other, and he attempted to retrieve what was lost by arguing that we were really not as bad as we were painted, and that there really is not much difference between our resolution and the resolution adopted by the committee. The latter was, of course, no truer when stated at Stuttgart than when it is stated here. But there was an excuse for it at Stuttgart which is absent here, which makes the statement here absolutely indefensible. When Comrade Hillquit made the statement at Stuttgart he was engaged in the laudable effort of rehabilitating us in the opinion of our comrades, and the means adopted were at least harmless. Here, however, the situation is different: There is no reason for hiding the truth. With the better light that Comrade Hillquit has seen at Stuttgart, he ought to be showing the comrades who still abide in darkness the error of their ways, instead of telling them that our resolution was all right, but that we must submit, etc. Of course, Comrade Hillquit is right when he says that as good socialists we have to abide by the decision of the majority. But it is hardly worth while wasting much effort on this subject: there is no danger of our refusing to abide by the decision of the International Congress. But there is danger of some of us retaining our false notions on the subject-matter itself to the great detriment of our movement. I shall therefore next take up the question upon its merits, as Comrade Hillquit should have done long ago.

New York, November 22, 1907.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(Note by the Editor. We are informed that this article was offered for publication in *The Worker* of New York and was rejected. In view of the importance of the subject, the REVIEW will gladly print brief communications either for or against the Stuttgart resolutions.)

EDITOR'S CHAIR

To the Readers of the Review. The new editor hardly needs to introduce himself, since he has been in touch with you for years through the Publishers' Department. But he takes pleasure in introducing his associates. John Spargo, whose article on "Woman and the Socialist Movement" opens our present issue, and who also edits the department of book reviews, is one of the ablest and most popular writers in the Socialist Party of America, and is an active and trusted member of the party in New York. He has had a wide and varied experience as manual laborer, preacher, editor, writer and lecturer, and has a sympathetic understanding of the necessary ways of thinking of all sorts and conditions of men, along with a clear grasp of the Marxian philosophy. Ernest Untermann, from whose pen an article entitled, "Pause and Consider", on the proposed union of the two socialist parties, will appear next month, has been a frequent contributor to the Review for years, and his books are sufficient proof that he combines a phenomenal scholarship with a distinctively proletarian way of thinking. He is at present living in Idaho, many miles from a railroad, and where mail communications are slow and uncertain, so that it is impossible for him just now to be as active as he would like to be, either on the Review or in the general work of the party, but he promises all the help in his power. Robert Rives LaMonte, who contributes this month the article on "Methods of Propaganda", is well known from his translations, his recent book "Socialism Positive and Negative" and his articles contributed to these pages in the past, and we feel sure that every Review reader will be glad of his promised co-operation. Max S. Hayes, editor of the Cleveland Citizen and one of the most influential members of the Typographical Union, will continue to edit the department of labor news.

What the Review Stands For. The Review will as before treat all subjects from the view-point of international socialism, and will support its principles. The editor is a member of the Socialist Party of America, and believes that all socialists in the United States can make their work for socialism count most effectively by working with the party. The Review however will open its pages to competent writers from all points of view, no matter whether they are inside or outside the Socialist Party, no matter whether they are for socialism or against it. We reserve the right to criticise all articles, but the absence of criticism does not necessarily imply that the editor agrees with all the views expressed. Indeed, the views expressed in every issue of the Review will usually be so various that no one with the-

least sense of logic could agree with all of them. We regard clear thinking as essential to a healthy socialist movement, but clear thinking can not be attained by the Socialist Party's passing any set of resolutions; it can not be attained by trying to exclude from the membership of the party either opportunists or impossibilists, either Christians or materialists. It can best be attained by free, critical, logical discussion. And to afford a field for such discussion is the function of the International Socialist Review. It is sometimes objected that the Review, and a large proportion of the books issued by the same publishing house, are not good to "make socialists". The objection is perfectly well taken, but it shows a misunderstanding of one of the things that needs to be done. There are plenty of propaganda papers to bring socialism to the attention of the unconverted; the Review does not compete with these. Such papers very properly exclude from their columns any full discussions of questions on which socialists differ among themselves. Yet it is necessary that such questions be discussed if they are ever to be solved rationally, and the Review is the place for such discussions.

Socialist Unity. The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Labor Party adopted on Jan. 7 a preamble and resolutions setting forth the desirability of a consolidation of the two socialist parties, and electing a committee of seven to confer with a similar committee to be elected by the Socialist Party. Algernon Lee, member of the National Committee of the Socialist Party from New York State, has introduced a resolution on which the National Committee is voting as we go to press. It provides that the incoming National Executive Committee be designated as a committee of seven from the Socialist Party to meet with the committee from the S. L. P. to discuss terms of union. This motion has already received the endorsement of the New York State Committee of the Socialist Party. This action is exactly in line with the views of the present editor of the Review, as outlined by him in a signed article published in the December number. We do not, however, fail to realize the complexity of the question and the many objections that may fairly be urged. A thoughtful statement of these objections is embodied in the article by Ernest Untermann referred to above, and we regret that the length of the article and the late hour at which it was received made it impossible to publish it in this month's Review. It will appear in the March number, and meanwhile we will neither summarize Comrade Untermann's arguments nor answer them, since it is only fair to let him speak for himself. The Social Democratic Herald and the Christian Socialist have both come out emphatically against union with the Socialist Labor Party on any terms. But to our mind, if the Socialist Party were to vote down Comrade Lee's motion it would put itself in a false position before the socialists of other countries and the unorganized socialist sympathizers of the United States. If our party refuses to negotiate, it will fairly be held responsible for the failure to unite. The rational course seems to be to go into the conference, and then stand for the right of the membership as a whole to run the affairs of the consolidated party in accordance with the will of the majority. Roughly estimated, the membership of the Socialist Party is rather more than 30,000, while that of the Socialist Labor Party is rather less than 3,000. If the 3,000 will not unite unless the 30,000 will reverse their tactics and methods in some such way as was suggested by Local Redlands, California, then the responsibility for the failure of union will rest on the Socialist Labor Party, and the more desirable members of that

party will be likely to leave the sinking ship and join the Socialist Party. On the other hand, if the Socialist Labor Party is willing to accept the principles of majority rule and work with us on that basis, this will be pretty good proof that the misgivings of some of our own members are unfounded.

The Wave of Prohibition. On another page is a report of a set of resolutions presented by the socialist aldermen of Milwaukee in response to a movement on the part of the capitalists to place new restrictions on saloons. In the same temper is an article by H. Quelch in the January number of the London Social Democrat, who lashes most artistically the hypocrisy of the Temperance Reformers, who propose to prevent the workingman from spending his money for drink, so that he can live more cheaply and thus work for lower wages. On the other hand, an address delivered by Comrade E. Wurm at the last national convention of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, which is being circulated as a propaganda pamphlet by our German comrades, and which we expect to publish in next month's Review, explains the evils of alcoholism as forcibly as the prohibitionists and much more logically, and advocates practical measures. The question is up for discussion. The old-time prohibition movement was a matter of sentiment and emotion; the new prohibition crusade is a matter of business. In the days that are gone a laborer could get drunk once in a while with no particular injury except to his own family if he had one, and in a very slight degree to his employer. If he missed too many days the employer would hire some one in his place, having lost only the surplus-value he might have extracted from the drinker's own labor-power. Things are different now. The laborer now is a cog in a great wheel of a great machine, and if one particular cog is missing at a given moment the whole machine is more or less out of joint. Three or four workmen by absenting themselves from their posts on a Monday morning may cause a hundred to stand around idle and unpaid, waiting for the machine to be in working order again. If their loss of wages were the only loss, we should not hear so much of the matter, but what is far more important in the eyes of all "good" people, the capitalist loses not only what he might have made from the labor of the four convivial spirits, but also what he might have made from the labor of the ninety and six that went not astray. As the capitalist runs the government he proposes to do something about it. Hence the wave of prohibition which is sweeping over the United States and England. What position shall we as socialists take? The question is too big to settle in a paragraph. But it is up for discussion and we shall have to take a stand on it before long.

Economics and the Negro. A few months ago we published a translation of a notable article by Paul Lafargue entitled "Marx's Historical Method". Lafargue pointed out the folly of socialists who waste their time in long-winded discussions of Marx's method, instead of using the method in a practical way. We are glad that an American socialist of scholarship and ability has followed Lafargue's good advice, and we congratulate our readers on the series of studies, beginning in this month's Review, on the economic aspects of the negro problem. This seems a good time to put in a word of defense for the Marxian theory against a sort of criticism which we expect from capitalist editors but which seems annoyingly stupid when, as sometimes happens, it is brought forward by members of our own party. When we explain changes in ideas as held by masses of men

and in social institutions by changes in the mode of production, they claim that we are overlooking people's affections, or their artistic impulses, or their religion, or their inborn depravity, or some such considerations. What they seem unable to see is that we can not explain a motion by a rest,—a variation by something that remains constant. Comrade Robbins will show in these articles that the negro was at one time left in his native freedom by the proud Anglo-Saxon, later reduced to slavery, then given nominal freedom but exploited like other laborers. Now the white men who treated him in these various ways were all more or less affectionate, artistic, religious or depraved according to the point of view of the reasoner, but, as our writer will show, the men of each successive epoch differed from the others in the way in which they produced and circulated goods. And these changes in the mode of production, rightly understood, explain what has happened to the negro. Moreover they may throw some light on the present interests and the future action of both the negro and those who come into direct relation with him. These articles will repay close study, and it is to be hoped that American socialists will now rapidly apply the same method to other problems.

Socialist Party Elections. The present method of electing the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of America has in practice been proved to have certain defects which under circumstances that might arise hereafter would be a source of danger. Every local and member at large is now allowed to nominate seven candidates, and the names of all who accept are placed alphabetically on an Australian ballot which is used by all party members in voting. The seven who receive the highest vote are declared elected. One result of this method is that many comrades are voted on whose names are entirely unknown outside their own state, often even outside their own local. Those who vote for these "favorite sons" seem to forget that in this way their votes have nothing at all to do with determining the make-up of the committee. Again, the multitude of names (there are 133 on this year's ballot), is bewildering and confusing to the average member; there is scarcely any intelligent discussion as to the stand on party questions taken by the various comrades who really stand a chance of election, and many members mark the names of candidates simply because they have seen them mentioned in papers or have heard them speak from the soap-box. Finally, with a large share of the vote split up among a lot of candidates who have no chance of election, the successful ones are usually the choice of a minority, and often of a very small minority. This would make it possible for a compact and well organized faction to elect, under our present constitution, a majority of the National Executive Committee, even if two thirds of the membership were opposed to the tactics favored by those candidates. A second ballot would solve the difficulty, but so much of labor and expense is involved in taking a ballot that some other remedy should be found if possible, and the best suggestion yet made is that no name be placed on the ballot to be used by voters unless placed in nomination by at least ten locals. This would probably keep the number of candidates within reasonable limits and would be a step toward majority rule.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

England. The English Parliament, which reassembled on Jan. 25th, will doubtless drag out its governmental comedy as long as possible. The present ministry has carried out practically none of its promises. Now it is under pledge to introduce a new education bill, a "licensing" bill, an old-age pension bill, and an eight-hour law for miners. No one supposes it will be able to force through the House of Lords any measure really worth while, but it may manage to remain in office for some time, and that seems to be the main point.

Meanwhile our Socialist comrades are making the most of their opportunity. The miserable failure of all the regular English half-way measures gives them a magnificent opening. The Irish peasants are up in arms, "driving" cattle from the landed estates and in other ways protesting against the present regime. One fifth of the population of London is subsisting on charities—and at that, so poorly are the provisions of Parliament carried out that starvation is not uncommon. Municipal ownership has finally been shown up as the most ludicrous sort of a fiasco. Meantime news comes from Hull that on Jan. 22nd the Laborites definitely decided to make Socialism the objective of their party. 1500 meetings are being held every week, and the mutton-chop Conservatives and Liberals are scared into a veritable frenzy.

In the colonies matters are quite as lively as on the "tight little island." Now it is particularly the Indian revolutionists who are making themselves disagreeable. Led by the famous Tilak, they created such a division in the recent provincial congress at Surat that the government felt obliged to intervene, and the deliberations came to nought. The English are making a desperate attempt to keep the "moderate" natives loyal to the imperial government, but the breach between races seems to be widening and home-rule comes on apace.

In the Transvaal history is repeating itself in the most ironic fashion. A few years ago the English clubbed the Boers into giving what was called "fair play" to the Uitlanders. In this noble enterprise the Indian troops of his Majesty assisted eagerly. Now about 10,000 peaceable, harmless Hindus, for some time settled in the country, are beginning to get an economic foothold. And the "fair-play" English, strange to say, join with the Boers to make life unendurable for these new Uitlanders. The Englishman loves to "civilize" the Hindu in his own country where he is a native to be exploited. But let the Hindu use "Civilized" methods? Let him do the exploiting? That is a horse of another color. One wonders what will be the effect of these latest developments on Indian loyalty.

France. The situation among the wine-growers of central France is rapidly clearing itself. Formerly a good many workingmen were deceived by the identical-interest-of-capital-and-labor argument. In consequence of large sales of spurious wines the prices of the real article fell off and production decreased by nearly forty per cent. Hundreds of workers were discharged; others had their pay reduced or their hours lengthened. As a result of this in 1905 about forty labor unions sent representatives to the Congress of Beziers and took part in the organization of the **Confederation Viticole**. This organization was controlled by capitalists, and its purpose was to prevent the fraudulent production of wine. The proletarian members of it were denounced by their fellows, but maintained that through this organization they saw their only way to regaining the means of livelihood. But the cloven hoof of capital was not long concealed: the workingmen are still looking for their share of the benefits of combined action. Meantime union organizers have been active among them. The Congress of Agricultural Workers held at Beziers the 3rd and 4th of last November passed a clear resolution in favor of an anticapitalistic propaganda. Since then the straggling union men have gradually been coming back into line, and it is safe to say that we shall never again be treated to the strange spectacle of slaves and masters marching side by side through the streets of French cities.

Germany. The tasks confronting the German ministry seem insuperable. The imperial debt has increased to about \$1,000,000,000, and the deficit in the present budget is \$30,000,000. Despite these facts Heligoland is to be fortified, the navy is to be increased and \$100,000,000 has been asked for to dispossess Polish landowners. Meantime prices of food-stuffs increase, new taxes fail to produce the necessary revenue, and the government fears the voting of a direct tax would give the Social Democrats too great an advantage. In the face of such conditions it is doubtful whether Chancellor Von Buelow can hold his slender majority for long.

On Jan. 10th. there culminated in Berlin the first act of a drama which has been a long time preparing. For many months Socialists all over Germany have been holding meetings in support of the movement for manhood suffrage in Prussia. Since soon after the Revolution of 1848 Prussia has suffered under a three-class electoral system. According to this system the voters are divided into three classes according to the amount of property upon which they pay taxes: these classes have equal voice in the choice of members of the Landtag. In the first class are a few of the very rich, in the second, a somewhat larger number of the middle-class proprietors, and in the third, the great mass of the proletarians. The first two classes always vote together—so the workingmen may as well stay at home. And that is just what most of them do. They have never had a representative in the Landtag. In the last election twelve per cent of the people elected 803 out of 943 representatives.

As was to be expected the manhood suffrage bill, supported by the Social Democrats, received scant courtesy from both government and Landtag. The Chancellor remarked disdainfully that the ministry had some changes in mind, but would report about them when it got ready; and the proposed law was voted down without a division.

Immediately 50,000 people crowded about the imperial palace and for a time really threatened to disturb the peace of their benevolent protector. But the police bore down on the manifestants, wounding

many and imprisoning many more. Now the matter has been brought before the Reichstag, where the Social Democrats have a voice in affairs, and the end is not yet. Unless the government yields, which is unlikely, it is hard to see how the affairs can end without serious violence. It is plainly a case in which violence would be justified.

For two months the German press has been much wrought up over a report that evidence had been discovered connecting the German Socialists with a Russian terrorist plot. Near the close of November the Berlin police reported the breaking up of a meeting of Russian Anarchists. Most important among the treasures discovered in the meeting-place was a consignment of paper said to have been ordered by a book-keeper of the company which publishes **Vorwaerts**, the Socialist organ. With no more evidence than this the bourgeois papers raised a mighty howl. The editors of **Vorwaerts** maintain that they know nothing of the matter, and that even if their book-keeper did order the paper that does not implicate them or the party leaders.

Austria. Statistics recently published by the Austrian Department of Commerce show a significant increase in the activities of labor unions. In 1905 there occurred in Austria 686 strikes; in 1906, 1083. In 1905 the men called out numbered 99,591; in 1906, 153,688. 22.3 per cent of the strikes called during the latter year were entirely successful, 47.4 per cent, partially successful, and only 30.3 per cent failed completely.

Italy. In Italy the Socialist party and the trades unions are passing through a crisis which is not without its lessons for the American movement. At the congress which met in Florence early in October a common program was agreed upon by the Socialist party, the confederation of labor unions and the parliamentary group. The day after the last session of the congress there occurred an event which set the Italian labor world in an uproar. A trainload of strike-breakers, who had been sent into Milan to break up a strike of gas-fitters, were being deported. At one point they were received by a crowd of strikers; it is reported that some stones were thrown, but none of the scabs were injured. The soldiers sent to protect the train fired into the crowd, wounding ten strikers and killing one. The railroad employees of Milan immediately declared a sympathetic strike. In this they were not supported by their central council or by the Socialist party. The strike was called off, but in a spirit of intense bitterness the strikers accused the central authorities of trying to make themselves solid with the bourgeois element. Malcontents to the number of 200,000 finally sent delegates to a convention which met at Parma on November 3rd. Ringing resolutions were passed denouncing the pacivist Socialist leaders and declaring for an open fight to the finish against the capitalist system. Just what will come of the new movement started at Parma it is difficult to tell at this distance; it is impossible for one not on the ground to see through the shower of charges and counter charges. Probably the whole disturbance is merely a sign of healthful growth. But even if it is, it shows the dangers which result from lack of mutual understanding among different wings of the movement.

Spain. The central organization of the Spanish trades union movement has recently purchased the famous palace of the dukes of Bejar and is rapidly remodeling its apartments into offices, school-

rooms, assembly halls, etc. The Socialist party in Spain is still weak, but the labor movement is going forward by leaps and bounds.

Belgium. A new ministry has been made necessary in Belgium by the fight concerning the disposition of the Congo Free State. King Leopold has offered to give this great province to the people of Belgium providing they will allow him to keep as much as he chooses. In Parliament both the extreme right and the extreme left are opposed to this arrangement. Thus the new ministry has a delicate problem on hand.

Russia. Russian reactionists have recently been flooding Europe with reports that the peasants have at last come to their senses and lost faith in the revolutionary leaders. Everything will soon sink back into its old track, we are told. And it is undeniable that Russian affairs appear to be abnormally quiet. The Duma goes on talking and taking no definite action: the government seems to feel that it once more has the reins safe in hand. But we are assured by the revolutionists that this is merely a temporary lull. The former disturbances lacked the popular backing, the concentration of force which is necessary to success. Now a vigorous propaganda is being carried on so that when matters again come to a crisis the Russian people will shake off their stolid indifference and assert their power.

Japan. The most noteworthy feature in the socialist movement in Tokio is a gathering called "Kinyo Koven" or the Friday Lecture meeting which meets every Friday evening in Yoshidaya Hall, Kanda, Tokio. Though they are yet small in number the attendants of the meetings consist not only of Japanese but of Chinese, Hindoos, Filipinos and Koreans as well. It is very interesting to observe that these revolutionists of Asiatic countries gather together in one hall and talk about Socialism and the betterment of their respective countries. This is the first practical attempt ever undertaken by the Japanese Comrades to unite and co-operate with the Socialists of all Asia. There are hundreds of Chinese socialists who are studying in Japan at present and we find a good many women among them. Comrade T. Sakai has been adding an excellent contribution to the Japanese Socialist literature recently by translating and compiling a series of popular scientific works, especially those which relate directly to the rise of socialism in the light of the modern evolutionary theory. Comrades Kotoku, Yamakawa, Shidzuno and Sakai will be the authors of this socialist scientific series. The Heimin Shinbun which is practically the successor of the famous "Daily Heimin Shinbun" is planning to move its office to Tokio this spring in order to make it a central feature and help along the entire movement in Japan. A little sheet called "Rodosha" (The Laborer) which comes out once a month is edited by Comrades Sakai and Yamakawa. It seems to have struck the demands of the workers there. Every Socialist is now interested in the paper and is circulating it among the factory workers, miners, farmers, and day laborers. This little four page sheet is not a regular magazine or paper. It only contains a few well prepared articles on socialism in the plain language—the language of the laborers. It has already proved a great success and is welcomed by the workers, for it tells the truth in their own language and carries the message direct to their heart.

WHISPERINGS IN THE LIBRARY

BY JOHN SPARGO

The ordinary Socialist has, I suppose, little patience with much that passes under the name of "Christian Socialism", and the temptation is strong to echo a famous remark that it is neither Christian nor Socialist. There is good historical reason for this attitude of suspicion and distrust. The Socialist who has read the history of the Socialist movement in Europe, especially in Germany and Austria, will naturally think of Pastor Stöcker and his Christian Socialists, so-called, with their **Mucker-Socialismus**, anti-semitism and attacks upon the Social Democracy. Or, they will think of the Christian Socialists of England, Kingsley, Maurice, Ludlow, and others, who were most admirable men, stalwart friends of the poor and oppressed, but most certainly not Socialists in the modern sense of the word. They were reformers and philanthropists to whom no one would nowadays give the name Socialists.

But we have to-day to face the fact that there is a Christian Socialism which is genuinely entitled to the name. At least, many Christians do advocate straight Socialism—and it is not our business to pronounce upon their right to call themselves "Christians". In England we have Christian Socialists definitely accepting Marxian Socialism, and in this country we have active and uncompromising members of the Socialist Party formed into a Christian Socialist organization to preach Socialism to their fellow Christians. In Germany, the land where a generation ago, the Socialist movement made war upon all forms of religion, we have this very thing encouraged and Bebel giving his benediction to Pastor Kutter's book **They Must!**

The times have changed. Socialism has changed and Christianity has changed—a statement which will probably cause both Christian and Socialist to brand me as a heretic! What I mean is that, partly as a result of the "higher criticism" and partly as a result of the agnostic's challenge, modern Christianity has largely divested itself of its theological trapping and become once again an ethical movement. True, there remain some of the old ceremonials and theological phrases, but by the progressives they are not regarded as a vital and essential feature of Christianity. On the side of the Socialists it may be said with equal truth that the movement has largely passed from the influence of the philosophic materialism of the middle of the nineteenth century. The onslaught of the latter upon Christian dogma has had its effect. On the whole, I am about as much amused by those belated rationalists who keep on attacking a Christianity which has ceased to exist, as I am by the belated critics who keep on making against the Socialist movement of to-day the criticisms

which applied only to the utopian Socialism, so-called, of fifty years ago.

I am led to these reflections just now as a result of a careful reading and re-reading of two notable books, frank and unflinching advocates of Socialism, written from the Christian point of view. They are: **Christianity and the Social Crisis**, by Prof. Rauschenbusch, and **Christianity and the Social Order**, by the Rev. Dr. R. J. Campbell, of the City Temple, London, Joseph Parker's famous pulpit. The author of the first of these books is. I believe, a member of the Socialist Party, while the author of the second has definitely joined the movement in England, and, it is said, will be a Socialist candidate for parliament next election. Both volumes are published by the Macmillan Company.

The two books have much in common besides the striking similarity of titles. They agree in the main, though they reflect the widely different intellectual habits of the writers. The English book reflects the mind of the expositor, the popular preacher, whose success depends upon a simple and forceful presentation of his subject. He must perforce take the results of scholarship and research and popularize them for his auditors. Professor Rauschenbusch, on the other hand, is an academician. He has the scholastic bent of mind and demands time to lay his case before you. He is a teacher whose business it is to give his pupils a thorough knowledge of the subject. I would not by this distinction imply that Dr. Campbell's book lacks scholastic merit or Prof. Rauschenbusch's clarity. Neither of these criticisms would be just. All that I would imply is that the one was born of the pulpit while the other was born of the classroom.

Prof. Rauschenbusch goes back and traces the historical roots of Christianity in a chapter which, not so many years ago, would have caused his banishment from the Church. Jesus emerges out of that historical background as a stern moralist, to whom religion was a social thing, a matter of relations and not of creeds. He was not a Socialist, simply because the economic conditions of his time were not productive of Socialist thought. But he was one of the line of prophets of social righteousness to which belonged Isaiah, Micah, Amos and Joel. Always ready were they, to defend the oppressed and to scourge the oppressor with words of withering rebuke. One gathers from Prof. Rauschenbusch a concept of Christianity which would justify most men who now call themselves Atheists and Agnostics being included in the category of Christians. Theological Christianity is dead!

With masterly skill, he traces the corruption of Christianity and the grafting upon it of the creeds and theological beliefs about which the nations have warred so long. He is as candid as Truth itself; and, while he does not mention it, the Socialist who is familiar with Marxian philosophy will recognize the skill with which the historical method of Marx has been applied to the unravelling of the tangled threads of religious history. Strangely enough, this is not sustained through the closing chapters in which the author makes his plea to the Christians for Socialism. Here his inherent idealism carries him along, so that his appeal is mainly to the idealism of his readers. Yet, upon the whole, it is a striking and effective plea for Socialism, and one lays down the book with the feeling that such a presentation of Socialism cannot fail to do good. There is none of the upbraiding of Socialists for their "crass materialism" common to much of the literature of Christian Socialism, nor any attempt to rest the case for Socialism upon textual bases. He sees in Socialism the greatest

spiritual force of the age, and would have the churches shake off the incubus of dead formalisms and join in the movement.

Dr. Campbell's book can be more briefly described. The substance of the book seems to have been preached to his congregation. More briefly than Rauschenbusch, he sketches the historical roots of Christianity, and his picture of Jesus is very like to that outlined by our American comrade. Everything of the miraculous and supernatural is cast aside, except the resurrection. This he is unable to discard. **Something**—he is at a loss to know what—must have occurred. At any rate, the first Christians must have believed it and been inspired by it. He, too, reduces the whole of the teaching of Jesus to a social ethic and, while pointing out that Jesus was not a Socialist, claims for modern Socialism and the teachings of Jesus a common objective—equality of opportunity, fraternity and social justice.

From this point, Dr. Campbell plunges into a whole-hearted advocacy of Socialism. The latter part of the book reads like a collection of arguments for Socialism compiled from the party press from such writers as Blatchford, Hyndman, and others. He cites figures to illustrate the shortcomings of the present system, in pages as simple and virile as **Merrie England**. Then he passes on to outline the Socialist programme, accepting it all, balking at nothing. He answers all the old hoary objections to Socialism and gives a lucid and interesting chapter to the discussion of various problems which are of especial importance in England from the Socialist viewpoint.

To understand just what this book signifies, the reader must remember that it was only four years ago that Dr. Campbell made an attack upon the labor movement in England. He was challenged to appear at a mass meeting of labor men and repeat his attack, which he did with characteristic courage. At that meeting his education in Socialism really began, and two years later he declared himself a Socialist in a sermon preached at City Temple.

* * *

Leonard D. Abbott has written a charming little sketch of the life of Ernest Howard Crosby, which the Ariel Press, of Westwood, Mass., has issued in a most attractive booklet. The sketch takes up only thirty-two pages and there are several lengthy quotations from Crosby's writings, so that Comrade Abbott has confined himself to very narrow limits. It is a friend's tribute to the memory of a friend, a tender valuation of his character. It is the best bit of work that Comrade Abbott has yet given us, and will doubtless be welcomed by many of Crosby's friends and admirers.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

Labor is being treated to object lessons thick and fast these days. That old relic of a past age, the Hon. Joe Cannon, not only refuses to permit any labor bill to be reported to the House and the fossilized Senate yawns and looks bored whenever working class interests are even mentioned in whispers, but the few so-called labor laws that are on the statute books are being wiped of by the Supreme Court. First the seamen of the Pacific coast, who demand the modification of an injunction that ties them hand and foot at the solicitation of a powerful corporation, are given an icy glare and told in so many words to "get to hell out of here," then, secondly the employers' liability law is crippled for life at the behest of the railways, and, thirdly, the laws existing in various states prohibiting blacklisting are declared unconstitutional at the solicitation of other corporations. Now, to cap the climax, having informed the capitalists of the nation that they can proceed and blacklist (or boycott) every workman who dares to dream of having a grievance, the court of last resort has reversed all previous decisions and declared a boycott of capitalists by laborers to be an unlawful conspiracy. Along about the time the Supreme Court has had its inning, congress can start grinding out more privileges for the "best" people, such as ship subsidies, tariff revisions; asset currency, and the like. Thus while the poor boycotters find jails yawning to receive them, the rich boycotters will receive their usual hand-outs of pie from the merry gangs of grafters who hang about Washington like vultures surrounding a carcass. Yet there are thousands of doughfaced workingmen who will howl themselves hoarse this fall and cheer on the "bunk" game in which they themselves are being the aggrandizement of capitalism. Probably the foolkiller became disgusted and committed suicide.

The cheap-skate plutocrats and all-around snobs who have been running things with a high hand at Goldfield seem to be up against a stiff proposition. Briefly, the situation is about like this: Many of the Goldfield operators have been heavy borrowers on the strength of the tales of fabulous mineral wealth in the district. Bonds were put up as security in San Francisco, New York and other places. But while on the one side the showers of gold did not drop into the hats of investors that were promised, which caused the latter to become pessimistic and refuse to invest in more stocks, the bondholders, by depressing the market, hoped to acquire control of the properties. Thereupon the operators fell upon the miners to make a reduction of a dollar a day, thus hoping with this spoil to feed the hungry bondholders and keep them quiet, and then, again, it was figured that when the bourgeoisie heard wages were reduced and

"high-grading" stopped investments would be on the increase and the Goldfield boomers (or bummers) would be in clover. But the big fight that was made by the miners disarranged the calculations of the get-rich-quick crowd, despite the fact that daily bulletins were sent out for weeks announcing that the strike is settled, the miners have returned to work, all mines are working full-handed, etc., etc. Therefore, it was necessary to do something else, especially as Roosevelt did not care about pulling chestnuts out of the fire for a besotted Democratic governor and cause his man Taft to be placed in an embarrassing position when people begin to ask questions this fall. So a state constabulary was put through and now the barkers, gold-brick swindlers and thimble-riggers are once more sending out bulletins through their corrupted press associations announcing in one breath that there will be "resumption of work in those Goldfield mines that are still idle and the employment of full complements of men by those working small forces," and in the next breath the "con" game assurance that the constabulary scheme "will probably add considerably to the strength of the market." You can almost hear those gold-brick artists shouting: "Step right up this way, ladies and gentlemen, and view the most wonderful, the most magnificent and marvelous valuables in the world. We don't want them; we want you to have them; take them for a mere bagatelle." And the yaps from Hayseed Corners will come along and—invest again? Perhaps and perhaps not—probably not if they have been bit before, and, the Lord knows, pretty nearly all of them back home have been up against a brace game of one kind or another during recent years. The truth of the matter is that the Goldfield swindlers have but few skilled miners at work. They did import several carloads of strike-breakers, but not many knew anything about mining. It is more than likely that when the weather breaks up many of the Goldfield miners will do prospecting on their own hook and then the "con" men will be worse off than at present. It is only fair to say in this connection that some of the daily papers have refused to print the doped bulletins sent out from Goldfield. On the contrary, they went after the swindlers without gloves and showed them up as the greatest aggregation of fakirs and crooks that had ever been gathered together anywhere under the blue canopy of heaven. From fake prize fights to salted mines the Goldfield grafters have been doing nothing but working "bunk" games on the American people until the very name of Goldfield has become a stench in the nostrils of the reading public. A wise speculator once said: "If you are considering the matter of investing money in mining stocks think the matter over carefully—and then don't invest." Which advice might be amended to read: "And if you were thinking of investing in Goldfield securities build a bond-fire in the stove with your money."

It may not be news to Review readers to learn that trouble is threatening along the lakes when navigation opens. Fully a year ago it was stated in this department that the employers contemplated making war upon the unions, and it appears that they are now ready to do battle, for they have come out in the open. Not only have the lumber carriers announced that the lumber handlers will be compelled to accept a reduction in wages, but the United States Steel Corporation, that uncompromising foe of organized labor, is clearing its docks in the lower lake regions and preparing for action. On the other hand, the longshoremen, who have one of the strongest unions in the country, do not intend to lie down. They are busily strengthening their lines and making ready to meet the issue. It is not

publicly known, but it is nevertheless a fact, that President D. J. Keefe had intended to follow the example of John Mitchell and retire from office this year, but since the issue has been raised by the employers it is doubtful whether the membership will permit Keefe to step down and out. Keefe is one of the oldest executive officials on the industrial field and has had exceptionally good success in handling some very intricate propositions during the dozen years that he has guided the destinies of the longshoremen, and they will be loth to part with him. Committees from the employers and unionists will meet next month for the purpose of considering the situation. It is practically certain that the men will not listen to a reduction and sign an agreement, and it is also probable that the vessel owners will demand a cut in wages. If a deadlock ensues you can look for guerilla warfare all over the lakes. The longshoremen have a card up their sleeve that they can play that it would hardly be proper to make public at this time, but which would cause the capitalistic interests no end of trouble and the loss of a good many dollars before they triumph in the battle to reduce wages. Meanwhile where are the seamen going to get off? Or will they remain on board? Watch the moves.

Things are not running smoothly, in the National Association of Manufacturers. It has leaked out that quite a number of influential manufacturers have deserted Van Cleave, Parry, Post & Co., as they do not admire their style of pitching. Some of the disgruntled element charge that Van Cleave has been meddling with the tariff question contrary to their interests, while others do not quite like the notoriety that they are receiving in being connected with a union-smashing organization. The desertions are said to have caused Mr. Van Cleave considerable worry, and that big little gentlemen is trying to explain in his organs all about what's the matter with Hannah.

When this month's Review is on the press representatives of the building trades, prodded by the attacks of the open shop masters, will be assembling in Washington for the purpose of establishing an international alliance subordinate to the A. F. of L. and to include all crafts. There is hardly a doubt but some plan will be worked out at this meeting to secure more harmony in the building trades and wipe out some of the old sores that resulted in one craft scabbing on another upon more than one occasion. Upward of a million mechanics, and laborers will be in the new alliance.

As perhaps most of the Review readers have learned, W. D. Haywood has resigned as secretary of the Western Federation of Miners. At present he is on a speaking tour in the eastern part of the country. It is almost useless to add that Haywood is being greeted by audiences that pack every meeting place, and from all accounts in exchanges the people are deeply interested in the narratives relating to the Western miners. It is also almost needless to say that the daily capitalist press studiously refrains from mentioning the Haywood meetings. Wonder why's the wherefore!

NEWS AND VIEWS

Sweet Reasonableness. My friend the editor calls for a starter for the Forum,—two hundred words, subject “Sweet Reasonableness,” a term which Matthew Arnold applied to the method of the socialist Jesus. The tooth and claw manner of attack used by the animals of the jungle is one way; sweet reasonableness, or the Missouri “Show me” way is another. I like best the latter way. It gets farther and lasts longer. Good natured, courteous reasoning enlightens, convinces and persuades. Most people distrust great big gallops of dogmatic assertions. Most people dislike hot denunciation. They believe some things are wrong but not everything. They are for mending but not destroying,—not knowing what would happen next. By their daily and life-time experience they know that people average much alike in generosity, fairness, selfishness, crookedness, regardless of religion, politics or class. They think they know something, as well as the cocksure and vindictive writer or speaker. But show them by reasoning and by familiar facts and illustrations how affairs can be improved on, and they listen, and by degrees come your way. There is a fraction of the people who are down and out, and ready for revolution. But the great majority know they are not slaves but free, they live comfortably, have what they regard a fair share of happiness, and can be drawn into a new system only by sweet reasonableness.

N. O. NELSON.

A Reader's Ideal for the Review. Here's a line to express my appreciation of “The Element of Faith in Marxian Socialism,” by Thomas C. Hall (in the January Review). We need many more articles in the same strain. Our sectarian dogmatism has already rendered our tactic less effective than it should be and could be. We do not begin to use the opportunities for propaganda staring us in the face. Our democracy does not flourish with a quarter the vigor of our sectarianism. We are already too doctrinaire. I also quote—unauthoritatively—a remark by Comrade Ghent that “the scope of the Review is too narrow”. How he would explicate this dictum I cannot say. But I endorse it in this respect: personally, as a new member and consequently as a student of all that the party ought to stand for. I need some good articles on tactics; some articles on organization, both theoretical and practical, more particularly articles describing the work of efficient locals and workers in the form of original essays or studies, not so much on the text of Marx as on the text of current events and conditions. In general I am persuaded that we should increase our efficiency if we all wrote half as much and twice as clearly, distinctly, forcibly, or instructively as we now

do. Inefficient words are a delusion—worse than a mere “sentimentalism”; thanks be to Labriola for this word and its content. Wishing increased service to the Review under its new editors, I am, fraternally,

T. J. LLOYD.

A Letter from Bradford, England. I was very much surprised on reading Robert Hunter's account of the British Labor Party. As outlined by him it will seem very plausible to those who do not know the whole of the facts. The Socialists of this country are in perfect sympathy with the withdrawal of the S. D. F. from the above organization. Those who understand what Socialism means and seeks to accomplish are heartily sick of the Labor Party. **It is bound to no programme and has no principles.** Social Democrats in all parts of the country are carrying on an active propaganda in their trades unions and trying to mould the Labor Party into a Socialist Party. The Social Democratic Federation left because their remaining in the ranks meant the subjection of their principles, their votes and actions to being controlled by a number of men, who, to say the least of it are not Socialists. I would like your readers to picture to themselves if they can, our comrades Hyndman and Quelch working in harmony with a man like Shackleton who thinks his seat of more importance than declaring for the raising of the school age to 16. If the articles on other countries are no more reliable than the one on England, I am afraid I must have my doubts about them. Your writer does not mention the fact that the I. L. P. Socialists object to a Parliamentary programme as formulated by the Trades Union Congress but are content with passing pious resolutions which are not binding on the Group who misrepresent the workers in Parliament. It is quite true that this may be as advanced as the rank and file, but this should not prevent them from trying to lead them to some higher ideal. A Socialist looks upon all public bodies merely as a platform for the advocacy of his principles. The British Labor-men are imbued with the idea that they are born administrators, and want to show the ruling classes how to administer capitalism. I along with other Social Democrats look upon all public bodies as platforms for the advancement of our principles. Our object is to break up all capitalist institutions and establish a state of Socialism.

G. MALTON.

Revising the Party Constitution. It should not be forgotten that one task of the coming National Convention of the Socialist Party is to revise the party constitution. To save the time of the convention and ensure careful consideration for every change proposed, a committee has been elected, consisting of W. R. Gaylord, 226 9th st., Milwaukee, Wis., James Oneal, 15 Spruce st., New York City, and Charles H. Kerr, 264 Kinzie st., Chicago, whose duty it is to consider all proposed changes in the constitution and recommend to the convention such changes as it deems advisable. The only change thus far proposed which has seemed important to the majority of the committee is a plan for improving the method for electing the members of the National Executive Committee. This is discussed on another page of the Review. It is probable that a final session of the committee will be held just before the opening of the National Convention, and all party members having changes to propose should present them to some member of the committee before that time.

Milwaukee Socialists on the Liquor Question.—The liquor question was discussed at a recent meeting of the Milwaukee City Council. The Social-Democratic aldermen introduced the following

resolutions: "Whereas, Milwaukee is known for the orderly character of its population—statistics showing that the number of arrests for crimes and misdemeanors of all descriptions are very much smaller in Milwaukee than in any other large city in the United States, and Whereas, especially the masses of the people and our working class are famous all over the United States for their intelligence, enlightenment and orderly habits, although their personal liberty is less restricted here than in any other city, and Whereas, Any existing abuses and excesses could easily be corrected and avoided under the present laws and ordinances if we had a decent mayor and an efficient chief of police: Therefore be it resolved, That there seems to be no special reason nor general demand for any further restriction of personal liberty in this city, and consequently the common council ought not to legislate any further on this question unless so ordered by a vote of the people, and further Resolved, That before any further measures in that direction are enacted, the following question shall be put to a referendum of the voters of Milwaukee at the next municipal election: Shall the common council enact any further restrictions on the beer and liquor traffic in the city of Milwaukee or not? Yes or No."

Britain Hoists Socialist Flag.—This is the Chicago Tribune's own head-line over the following dispatch published in its issue of January 26: In all the political movements of England possibly no such a sudden and remarkable swing of the pendulum of public opinion has ever been witnessed as that recorded this week, when in a conference at Hull representatives of millions of British workmen, forming the labor party, hoisted the flag of socialism. The party put itself on record as accepting the socialistic doctrine that production, distribution, and exchange should be controlled by a democratic state in the interest of the entire community, and as favoring the establishment of social and economic equality between the sexes. The English public is still so dazed over the suddenness of the avowal that only a few newspapers seem to grasp the real significance of the new situation. Persons who professed astonishment and fear when the lonesome figure of John Burns—since raised to a seat in the cabinet—entered parliament as a representative of a labor constituency many years ago have now a real reason to fear for the traditional conservative trend of British legislative institutions. Among other things, the latest move of the labor party really means that the cry of socialism will not only be raised with a strong voice in the house of commons but that the present labor members of parliament, who have so suddenly changed their political complexion, will be backed in pushing the socialistic propaganda by the strong organization and wealthy treasury of the labor party, though it is true that since the Hull meeting some nonsocialist members of the party have condemned its action and threatened to break away. Nevertheless, it now seems plain that, unless other political parties succeed in breaking up the socialist party, nothing short of a political revolution can be expected. There are indications that the present liberal government will attempt to obtain the early support of the socialists in the pending fight against the house of lords, and that if this aid is forthcoming the next session of parliament, beginning on Wednesday, is likely to be the most exciting in years.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

HELP MAKE A BETTER REVIEW.

Readers of the International Socialist Review will observe some changes with this issue. We hope they will be found improvements, but if not, the publishers want to know. Other changes will be made from month to month, if we find that changes will improve the Review. Send on your suggestions. They will not all be accepted but they will all be considered.

The Review was started nearly eight years ago. In a year from the time of starting it had about three thousand subscribers. At that time we attempted to supply copies returnable to newsdealers, and this took three thousand more, but so many of them were returned unsold with bills from the wholesale news company for double postage, that we lost money on every copy put out in this way, and were obliged to cut off the return privilege. We still have just about three thousand subscribers and the sales of copies each month bring the edition up to a little over four thousand, which has been our average for the past year.

This month we are increasing the edition to a little over five thousand copies and we want our subscribers, and especially our stockholders, to see that every copy is sold. The price is ten cents a copy, to stockholders five cents. The subscription price is a dollar a year, and the price to stockholders, **provided at least two subscriptions are sent at once**, is 60 cents a year.

All present and future changes will have just one purpose, and that is to make the Review as valuable, interesting and enjoyable as possible to socialist workingmen and working women. Editorially the Review will as in the past support the principles of International Socialism and the tactics of the Socialist Party of America. And as before the Review will be distinctively educational rather than a propaganda magazine. It will not appeal for the votes of those who know nothing of socialism. This work can better be done by the Daily Socialist, the Appeal to Reason and Wilshire's Magazine. What the **Review** will try to do is to print the things most wanted by the

average party member or the new socialist convert who wants to work for socialism. The editor can perhaps do a little toward making the Review realize this, but the readers can do a great deal more, and we want their help. Most of the matter in the Review is written without pay to help the work along. More articles are already sent in than we have room for, but still more are needed so that we can select only the best. And some writing must be paid for because some of those who can do the best work have to live from what they write, and if we can not buy their labor-power they must sell it to capitalists. Double our subscription list and the money will be ready to pay for making the Review twice as interesting as it has ever been. Remember that it is owned by a co-operative association of working people, and that not a dollar of its receipts will go to pay dividends. Last year and every year it has cost more than it brought in, the difference being made up by the sale of books and stock. This year let us all take hold and help, and make it pay for itself.

NEW BOOKS, READY AND NEARLY READY.

American Communities and Co-operative Colonies. By William Alfred Hinds, Ph. B. Second revision, 608 pages of text with 33 full-page illustrations, cloth, \$1.50. Now ready; a review by John Spargo will appear in next month's Review.

Evolution, Social and Organic, by Arthur M. Lewis, will be ready for delivery by the time this issue of the Review is in the hands of its readers. Cloth, 50 cents. We published an extended notice in this department last month, as we did also of the book next mentioned.

Human, All Too Human, a Book for Free Spirits, by Friedrich Nietzsche. This will be ready about Feb. 15; and will be the eighth volume of the Library of Science for the Workers. Price 50 cents.

Perfecting the Earth: A Piece of Possible History. This latest work by the author of "The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand" is a propaganda work that will be of great value among those who realize that social changes must come, but hesitate to vote for socialism because they can not imagine how the world can be run without capitalists. In this book, beautifully printed and illustrated, Dr. Wooldridge starts with a panic of 1903, for all the world like the panic of 1908, though he wrote the book some time ago, and shows how an intelligent application of human labor would quickly abolish poverty and provide comfort and luxury for all. The book is printed and bound expensively, but we have secured a few hundred copies which we offer while they last at \$1.00, with our usual discount to stockholders.

Goethe's Faust: A Study in Socialist Criticism. By Marcus Hitch. Standard Socialist Series, Vol. 26, cloth, 50 cents, ready about March 1. This book, by a socialist writer, who will be remembered as an able contributor to the pages of the Review, is an application of the Marxian method to the field of literary criticism. It is often

said, too often in fact, that writers like Shakespeare and Goethe are "not for an age but for all time". It can be shown, however, that the ethical standards which are taken for granted by "great" writers as well as other writers are definitely related to the economic foundations of the society in which they lived and wrote. This statement may seem a commonplace to socialists, but to others it seems startling and improbable, and therefore Mr. Hitch has not contented himself with making the statement; he has also proved it. In so doing he has written a very interesting little volume, which we recommend especially to those of our comrades who still think that socialism is a "purely economic" question, with no relation to art or to ethics.

The Russian Bastile. By Simon O. Pollock. Cloth, illustrated, 50 cents, ready about March 1. This will be a graphic picture of the horrors of the prisons in which many of our Russian revolutionary comrades are confined at the present moment. It will be an important link in the history of the revolution.

OUR FINANCIAL SITUATION.

Other important works are in preparation and will be announced in the near future, but we hope to receive orders for all these at once from every reader of the Review who can possibly afford them. The year 1907 was the most successful in the history of the publishing house. We increased our capital stock by \$3950.00 and the miscellaneous receipts of the year exceeded the expenditures by \$2018.53, so that we are nearly six thousand dollars better off at the end of the year than at the beginning. It should be remembered, however, that for years past we have been carrying a crushing load of debt, and that while we now only owe about \$2,000 to others than stockholders there is a debt of about \$8,500 to stockholders still to be paid. When this is accomplished we shall without doubt be able to reduce the prices on all socialist books, thus increasing their circulation immensely, and shall also be able to bring out new socialist books at a more rapid rate than before. Millions of books will be needed by socialist inquirers in the United States within the next few years, and we must get this publishing house in shape to provide them. Our receipts for the month of January included a contribution of \$8.10 from H. Culman of Hawaii and \$100 from the estate of Frank Kostack of Ohio. The receipts from the sale of stock were \$245.20, from the Review \$316.96 and from book sales \$1,425.06. The total is about a thousand dollars short of what we ought to have received but for the panic. We have met all bills promptly and have returned the loans of all stockholders who needed their money, but we are now paying interest on a bank loan which should be taken up so that the money required to pay interest on it can be used to pay for publishing socialist books.

There are probably five hundred readers of the Review who intend some time to send five dollars for a share of stock. Why not do it now? This is the time it will help the most, and if you send at once you will get both volumes of "Capital" or their equivalent in other books free with your certificate.